FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 033 19 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Chervov Discusses Moratorium in Interview [East Berlin] AA 1
'No Linkage' Exists Between INF, SDI Stances AA 1
[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 13 Feb]
U.S. Considers Varied Responses to Soviet Proposal [Bovin] AA 2
Negative U.S. Stance on Testing Causes Concern [Kornilov] AA 3
West Continues To Postpone Response to Proposal [Beglov] AA 4
Joint SDI Talks Seek To Deepen British Involvement AA 5
[Borin, Muchkin]
NATO Endorses Chemical Weapons Despite Initiative [Kharkov] AA 6
U.S. Evaluating Discussion of Chemical Weapons [Matyash] AA 7
'European Aspect' Vital to Disarmament AA 8
[Gontar in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]
Soviet Initiative 'Shatters' Military Threat Thesis AA 11
[Kiryan in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Jan]
Soviet, U.S. Geneva Delegations Hold Plenary Meeting AA 14

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Successes Cited at Press Conference BB 1
Voss Returns From Warsaw Parliamentary Meeting BB 1
[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 1
[Lavrentyev, Shishlin, Kasparov]
PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events CC 5
[Bolshakov, 16 Feb]
'Top Priority' Program on U.S.-USSR Relations CC 9
[Posner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Habib 'Grossly Interfering' in Philippines A 1
Assassination Plan Noted A 1
U.S. 'Applauds' French Military Action in Chad A 1
Anatoliy Gromyko Criticizes 6th Fleet Maneuvers A 2
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Feb]
Reagan Planning Creation of Caribbean Bloc A 3
Drama at U.S. Embassy Concert Recounted A 3
Various TV Linkup Programs Scheduled for 1986 A 4
[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]
Challenger Crew Victims of 'Irrational Haste' A 5
U.S. Battleship Iowa Sails for Central America A 5
U.S. Press Agencies Censor Gorbachev Interview A 6
[Knyazkov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Feb]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Talks To Resume With Japan on Cultural Pact [KYODO] C 1
Transcript of Shevardnadze's Tokyo News Conference C 1
[NEW TIMES 10 Feb]
U.S.-Japanese Fighter Exercises Under Way C 6
Military Ties Viewed [Agafonov in IZVESTIYA 15 Feb] C 7
IZVESTIYA Examines Japanese Political Scene [Agafonov, 16 Feb] C 7
Japanese Uncertainty Over SDI Discussed C 9
U.S. SR-71 Intrudes Into DPRK Airspace C 10

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Foreign Minister Analyzes Afghan Situation D 1
[Dost in IZVESTIYA 19 Feb]
Hunger Strike by Afghans in Iran Reported D 2
[PRAVDA 13 Feb]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Manila Demonstration Protests U.S. 'Interference' E 1
Soviet Liner Sinks Off New Zealand; Sailor Missing E 1
[Shmyganovskiy in IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]

EASTERN EUROPE

Poland's Messner Arrives for Official Visit F 1
Met by Ryzhkov, Aliyev F 1
Talks Begin F 1
Polish Foreign Minister Backs Gorbachev Proposals F 1
[Orzechowski in PRAVDA 17 Feb] F 1
Closer Soviet-Polish Scientific Ties Urged F 4
[PRAVDA 16 Feb]

WESTERN EUROPE

Car Bomb Explodes Near U.S. Embassy in Lisbon G 1
French Communists Seek Assembly Session on Chad G 1
'Euro-SDI' Possible Now, Claims FRG's Woerner G 1
Gorbachev Introduction to Greek Edition of Works G 2
[Athens RIZOSPASTIS 16 Feb]
Belgian Socialists Support USSR Arms Proposals G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Commentators Examine Recent Iran-Iraq Fighting H 1
Bovin Views Developments [IZVESTIYA 16 Feb] H 1
Demchenko Comments [PRAVDA 14 Feb] H 2
'Unprecendented Intensity' [Seyful-Mulyukov] H 2
Iraqi Foreign Minister Travels to Moscow H 3
Moscow Arrival [INA]
'Aziz View on Talks [INA] H 3
YSP Secretary General Arrives in Moscow [Aden] H 4
IZVESTIYA Commentator Discusses Mideast Issues H 4
[Kuwait AL-ANBA' 16 Feb]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Haiti Blocks Return, Deports Most Emigres K 1
Nicaragua Protests U.S. Troop Movements K 1
IZVESTIYA Profiles New Costa Rican President [16 Feb] K 1

CHERVOV DISCUSSES MORATORIUM IN INTERVIEW

DW181437 East Berlin Television Service in German 1945 GMT 13 Feb 86

[Interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov by correspondent Klaus (Hippert) on the "Objektiv" program; answers in Russian with superimposed German translation; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Chervov] The absolute majority of all states, the people of the world, governments, and political parties assess CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's initiative on a whole as positive, especially his nuclear disarmament program -- the liquidation of nuclear weapons on earth by the year 2000. It is stressed in comment that this program is not an utopia, not a fantasy, but a real program. The realism of this program is characterized by the fact that it is concrete, that it is to be implemented in phases, that it sets dates, deadlines, and an order for things, and that it points out ways in which nuclear armaments can be liquidated. In addition, the idea is being stressed that the Soviet Union and the United States have a certain experience of how weapons can be liquidated through common agreements. Also, both have the methods to practically destroy weapons. Therefore, the measures suggested by Mikhail Gorbachev are being considered really practicable; even more so, because the Soviet Union proposes to implement all these measures under strong national and international control and on site.

We wait for an answer from the U.S. Administration, we wait for an official answer. Much time has already passed and although the U.S. Administration states that it continues the studies and continues consultations with its allies, it is, nevertheless, time for an answer. The Soviet leadership and the leadership of the other socialist countries are fully aware of the fact that the destruction of nuclear weapons on earth is not an easy problem. At the same time, however, the leaders of socialist countries know that it must be done now. Today we stand at a threshold where it can be too late tomorrow, because the arms race today is already overtaking the negotiations. As you have certainly noted, Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, therefore, clearly says that one must act today, immediately. Nobody can stand aside in the fight against the threat of a nuclear war.

[Hippert] As is known, the Soviet Union has demonstrated and stressed its will for peace with this initiative, but also supported it with unilateral concessions made in advance. I have in mind the test moratorium that was extended for another 3 months.

[Chervov] In short, the significance of this moratorium consists of the fact that the discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests will lead to the antiguation of nuclear weaponry because the moratorium stops the qualitative development of nuclear weapons, their carrier means and warheads. Nuclear weaponry will not be further modernized, which is a great step toward the beginning of the destruction of nuclear weapons as a whole. The U.S. side understands that very well. If the moratorium will be adhered to, there will be no new kinds of nuclear ammunition, including laser weapons which the U.S. side wants to deploy in space with the help of nuclear explosions. This shows the enormous importance of the moratorium and, therefore, the Soviet Union asks the U.S. side to follow suit.

'NO LINKAGE' EXISTS BETWEEN INF, SDI STANCES

PM181445 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 13 Feb 86 p 14

[Anders Mellbourn report: "Continued Moratorium"]

[Text] The Soviet Union will probably not resume its nuclear tests before the next summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

This emerged yesterday when a high-ranking delegation of experts from Moscow arrived in Stockholm to explain Gorbachev's disarmament initiative.

The Soviet Embassy's movie theater was filled with everyone from peace activists to generals as well as journalists for the 2 hours during which the delegation from Moscow answered questions. The visit to Stockholm is part of the more open information policy which the new Soviet leadership is trying to introduce.

"The new Soviet disarmament initiative is a development and a continuation of what Mikhail Gorbachev put forward at the Geneva summit last fall, delegation head Albert Vlasov, CPSU Central Committee International Information Department sector chief, said. The remarkable thing is Geneva was that both the Soviet and the U.S. leaders jointly declared that a nuclear war must never be allowed to break out and that no one could win such a war.

Gorbachev's statement of 15 January this year outlined the goal that all nuclear arms be abolished by the year 2000. It also contains quite detailed proposals for different phases of disarmament which deviate to some extent from past Soviet stances.

It is true that the Soviet Union's forceful criticism of the U.S. space defense plans remains. But space defenses no longer stand in the way of all the other disarmament talks between the two superpowers. "There is no linkage whatsoever between medium-range nuclear arms in Europe and space defenses," said economic historian Oleg Bykov, who provided the more detailed security policy commentary.

The Soviet Union wants to discuss space defenses in connection with strategic nuclear disarmament. The conditions for negotiations on the controversial medium-range nuclear arms in Europe are simply that the United States undertake not to export such weapons to third countries and that the two other nuclear powers in Europe, Britain and France, do not increase the numbers of nuclear arms in their possession.

The Soviet delegation was happy about the positive reception which Gorbachev's proposals have received so far. Nothing critical was said about the United States; Albert Vlasov simply stressed that the United States has until the end of March to make its official reactions public.

By April the Soviet Union would also like to know how far the United States is prepared to support the nuclear test moratorium which the Soviet Union has been observing unilaterally since last fall. But from Vlasov's line of argument it was clear that the Soviet Union -- regardless of what the U.S. response will be -- is hardly likely to begin testing any nuclear arms before the next summit between Reagan and Gorbachev which will probably take place in Washington in June or July.

U.S. CONSIDERS VARIED RESPONSES TO SOVIET PROPOSAL

LD170025 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement, containing a 15-year plan for the elimination of nuclear armaments in stages, was announced exactly 1 month ago. Mikhail Sergeyevich addressed all peoples, all governments, but all the same, the main addressee was, understandably, the United States of America. Precisely this main addressee, has not yet replied to the Soviet proposals.

The general feeling in Washington at the beginning of the year was more or less that because the 27th CPSU Congress is approaching, it is improbable that any major foreign policy ideas will be formed in Moscow.

However, it turned out otherwise and the Soviet initiative itself, writes Ian Davidson in THE FINANCIAL TIMES, was totally unexpected both in terms of scale and timing. This has clearly stunned the entire West. Silence and incomprehensible utterances provide evidence for this. The twaddlers in strategic circles are clearly speechless. This was truly unexpected for them and the U.S. papers now report that three different versions, three different approaches to Soviet proposals, three different ways of answering them are competing against one another.

Here is Weinberger's version, that is, the Pentagon's: The Soviet proposals are sheer propaganda and enerally speaking, there is practically nothing in the U.S. position that need be altered in connection with them. And there is Adelman's version, that of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. On the whole, to give a positive answer on the issue of Euromissiles, proposes Adelman, it is necessary to suggest that the Soviet Union reduce by another 50 percent its SS-20's in Asia. And then there is Shultz from the State Department. On the whole, he agrees with Adelman and adds that it would be possible for both sides to confirm adherence to the ABM Treaty. So, these are the three versions. The selection, however, has not yet been made. The arguments are going on and on in the meantime.

Special presidential and secretary of state aides on the issues of disarmament Paul Nitze and Edward Rowny have been sent to Western Europe and Asia to consult with allies and friends; both are well-known U.S. political figures. Formally, they are having consultations on how to respond to Soviet proposals. But in essence, they have repeatedly been defending the U.S. stance, which rigidly insists on continuation of the "star wars" program. This was what Rowny was hawking around Australia and China, where, in my opinion, he was not very warmly received. He was, of course, in Japan, also.

NEGATIVE U.S. STANCE ON TESTING CAUSES CONCERN

LD170037 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 16 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The public opinion poll conducted in the United States by the newspaper WASHINGTON POST jointly with the ABC Television network has shown that 74 per cent of the Americans support the U.S.S.R.'s proposals on the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Although the Pentagon hawks are at pains to intimidate the Americans with inventions about the non-existent "Soviet menace", realization grows among millions of U.S. citizens that time has come when it is necessary that the process of intensified material preparations for war should be stopped and reversed, and the threat of nulcear catastrophe overhanging mankind be removed. A ban on the tests of overkill nuclear weapons would be the first practical step towards this goal.

Back last year, the Soviet Union came up with a major and genuinely constructive initiative. It terminated unilaterally all nuclear tests and called on the United States to join in this action. On January 15, 1986, the U.S.S.R. announced that it extends the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts by three months. It is clear that for our country to take such a decision was not a simple, an easy matter. The Soviet Union cannot display unilateral restraint with regard to nuclear tests ad infinitum. But the stakes are too high and the responsibility too great for us not to take every opportunity to influence the position of others through the force for example.

Keeping widely discussing and commenting on this step of good will by Moscow, prominent politicians and public figures in various countries and the press underline again and again that the importance of this action is truly hard to overestimate. For to terminate the nuclear tests means to put an end to perfection of nuclear arms, block the ways and opportunities for developing new and new types and varieties of weapons of destruction and death.

Nevertheless, Washington, at least until today, stubbornly refuses to follow the Soviet example and introduce a moratorium on nuclear blasts. Advocates of the arms race resort to all sorts of unseemly methods in their attempts to camouflage their true goals and whitewash their militarist stand. Now they set afloat a totally groundless version on certain "verification difficulties" which allegedly hamper a nuclear test ban.

Now they cite statements by Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defence secretary, and his likes and talk at length to the effect that the Soviet proposal on the moratorium is allegedly unacceptable since the U.S.S.R. has conducted more explosions at the present stage than the United States. In so doing, they overlook the fact that according to figures released by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the United States set off 772 nuclear explosions by early 1985 while the U.S.S.R. -- 556, and within the period when the Soviet moratorium has been in effect the gap has widened still more in favour of the United States...

In reality, the matter is, certainly, not in the imaginary difficulties involved in verification and as imaginary U.S. lag but rather in the fact that certain quarters in the United States would like to continue with reliance on force in politics and intend to add new and new types of weapons to militarist arsenals, including and primarily within the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative".

Senator Edward Kennedy wrote in THE WASHINGTON POST that "it is now possible to outline a series of far-reaching agreements which, with sufficient political will on the part of both sides, can be achieved in the next few years". As for the Soviet Union, its display of political will to detente and to curbing the arms race is at hand and the extension of the moratorium on all nuclear explosions is conclusive evidence of this. Will Washington display this will in action? The U.S. negative stand on such a crucial issue as a ban on nuclear tests regrettably prompts the thought that someone in the United States would obviously like to replace concrete steps on disarmament with rhetoric on the "need of arms control". This cannot fail to spark serious concern among both Soviet and international public...

WEST CONTINUES TO POSTPONE RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL

LD141407 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Spartak Beglov commentary]

[Text] President Reagan's State of the Union message is the first major political pronouncement by a Western leader following General Secretary Gorbachev's statement of 15 January in which he offered a bold 15 year plan for scrapping nuclear weapons plus other disarmament measures. Mr Reagan's message gave not the slightest hint as to America's official reaction to the plan. This is what Spartak Beglov of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY writes about it:

This is surprising, to say the least, in view of the widespread public support for the Soviet proposals. The Soviet nuclear disarmament plan obviously took the governments of the West by surprise.

And this time they cannot shrug it off as another Soviet propaganda ploy because in the eyes of millions of concerned people, it looks a very real thing. The Soviet plan presents a definite schedule for eliminating nuclear weapons with careful and balanced provisions for the security interests of other nuclear states and for fully controlling the disarmament process.

So why the prolonged silence on the part of NATO country governments? If one assumes that the main reason for this silence is the need for a careful study and exchange of views within the Western alliance, then it may be a good omen. But, unfortunately, the indications are just the opposite, namely that this delay is meant to give the vested interests a chance to fill the vacuum in the Western position with all sorts of artificial objections against a radical solution of the disarmament issue. It's an old tactic to prevent a sound disarmament idea from being realized by presenting the public with an accomplished fact. This is exactly what the Pentagon chief is doing when he claims that his military machine can't afford to go on without further nuclear tests. This is exactly what Mr Reagan is doing when in his State of the Union message he insists on creating a security shield, which is a codename for the "star wars" project. He actually wants us to believe that spending billions of dollars on a highly explosive astrocupola can one day render nuclear weapons obsolete.

There's a much safer, cheaper, and shorter way to achieve that: Start getting rid of nuclear weapons now and that is what the Soviet plan means to achieve before we enter the next century. Soviet readiness to start the realization of this most profound aspiration of humanity is evident, while the West still has to give a clear-cut answer.

JOINT SDI TALKS SEEK TO DEEPEN BRITISH INVOLVEMENT

LD190024 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Excerpts] This week a new round of negotiations is to be held between the Pentagon representatives and British Defense Ministry on Britain's participation in the "star wars" program. Here in the studio with me [not further identified] now are our observers, Nikolay Borin and Vadim Muchkin.

[Presenter] The British press and senior NATO officials, Lord Carrington among them, have been saying there is no way of going back on the "star wars" venture and that the project cannot be abandoned now that it has been taken up. What are your views?

[Borin] Indeed that idea is very much in vogue now and it concerns not only the "star wars" program. For instance, certain people begin to talk at length about the inevitability of the existence of nuclear weapons as soon as they hear about plans for scrapping nuclear weapons. The idea that something cannot be disinvented appears to run counter to every kind of logic. It suggests that it is the progress of time and technology and not political thinking that relies on force, that is piling weapons up and pushing the human race to a holocaust. It would be unfair to say that the progress of science and technology runs out of control. After all, it is under very tight control in the West. It would be unfair to say either that research cannot be stopped once it has got underway. It can. After all, some American and British universities have cut short research programs of great scientific and humanitarian interest and after all, big scientific teams have abandoned what they were doing to contribute to "star wars" research. Take for instance a department of Edinburgh University which was, until recently, doing advanced research into artificial intelligence. The outsize funds earmarked for the development and manufacture of new weapons slowed down the efforts of scientists to combat cancer, famine, or, for that matter, the effects of the drought in Africa.

The next round of the Anglo-American talks on developing attack space weapons will very likely involve Britain still further into Pentagon plans, but the crux of the matter has nothing to do with political or cosmic inevitability, but rather with the political will of concrete people who are pushing the country in that direction.

[Presenter] Thank you Nikolay Borin. And my next question is to Vadim Muchkin here. Britain, according to reports, will be involved in developing lasers for the American program and it looks as though this is going to be one of the crucial research and development undertakings under the "star wars" program. What can you say on that score?

[Muchkin] Indeed, this is going to be the central part of the program, but the British side stands little or no chance of getting out of it more than any American corporation will. Secondly, lasers are the most politically and militarily dangerous aspect of the "star wars" program. There is every indication that it is much easier to prohibit space weapons now than try to control such a destabilizing and dangerous system at a later date. And banning space weapons now is exactly what Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has proposed.

[Presenter] Nikolay Borin and Vadim Muchkin commenting on the new round of British-American negotiations on the "star wars" program.

NATO ENDORSES CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESPITE INITIATIVE

LD181731 Moscow TASS in English 1721 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 18 TASS -- TASS commentator Vasiliy Kharkov writes: The NATO leadership is going to endorse without discussion a U.S. plan to produce new kinds of chemical weapons.

Reporting this, REUTER news agency said American General Bernard Rogers, supreme allied commander in Europe, had included binary chemical munitions on the list of priority military needs for 1986 through 1992.

In order to avoid undesirable political consequences, suggestions on this score will be formulated in a special NATO document which will be submitted to the defense ministers of the countries grouped in this bloc when they get together next May.

Preparing to replenish American chemical arsenals with binary weapons, which are another, still more dangerous variety of chemical warfare agents, Washington intends to deploy them in the territories of its NATO allies. The plan is just as insidious as was the one to deploy American first-strike nuclear-missile weapons, namely Pershing-2's and cruise missiles, in Western Europe. West European countries are becoming not only nuclear-missile launch sites of the Pentagon but also storages of "quiet death," as chemical weapons are metaphorically called. It is easy to visualize the danger to these countries flowing from the American plans.

When U.S. Congress last December agreed to appropriate 124.5 million dollars to produce new kinds of chemical weapons, it made a reservation, stipulating that this kind of manufacture could be started only after obtaining the consent of the U.S. allies in NATO to the deployment of those weapons in their territories. Such consent is currently being prepared at the NATO headquarters.

Now that the latest Soviet proposals have touched off broad-based calls everywhere for ridding the earth of the threat of chemical death, the NATO binary weapons plans are especially ominous. The principled Soviet stand, which provides for completely eliminating chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture, is aimed at accomplishing the task within the near future. The concrete measures proposed by the USSR should be carried out under strict control, including international on-site inspections.

The USSR supports the proposal by the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia for establishing in central Europe a zone free from chemical weapons and the proposal by Bulgaria for creating such a zone also in the Balkans.

The exceptional significance of the Soviet initiative explains the extremely broad response it has evoked in all continents. The problem of chemical weapons, which is one of the most important to the future of humanity, must be solved.

U.S. EVADING DISCUSSION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD131849 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 13 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 13 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Vladimir Matyash. The Washington administration, by resorting to invented pretexts, is evading a serious and concrete discussion of the Soviet proposals for eliminating along with nuclear weapons such barbaric means of mass annihilation as chemical weapons by the year 2000. As is known, it agreed at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva to give momentum to the talks on concluding an effective and verifiable international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on the destruction of their stockpiles.

One is surprised to know that U.S. State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb, asked about the American stance on the prohibition of chemical weapons, on February 12 actually rejected the Soviet proposals for concluding a treaty that would prevent their proliferation. The United States, he said, believes "that a chemical weapons non-proliferation aggreement would not be an effective means to deal with the chemical weapons problem." Thus, the United States intends to pursue its dangerous and short-sighted course towards erecting artificial obstacles at the multilateral talks on banning chemical weapons that are being held within the framework of the conference on disarmament in Geneva. Moreover, it is seeking to undermine the early Soviet-American accords.

Official Washington apparently intends to lead the talks into an impasse and start the implementation of its 10 billion dollar programme of chemical rearmament. The United States already possesses a huge arsenal of chemical weapons -- more than three million shells, airbombs and mines which add to about 150,000 tons of chemical munitions stored in depots of the United States and its NATO allies.

According to scientists, this is enough to annihilate all living things on earth many times over. Washington, however, is about to add to the available arsenal a new variety of chemical weapons -- binary weapons that are slated for deployment first of all on the territory of several Western European countries.

Under these conditions, the chemical disarmament proposals, advanced in the January 15 statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, are of exclusive importance. In the statement, the principled Soviet position in favour of the total elimination of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production is oriented at resolving the problem within specific dates. This means that the convention should be worked out within the next 12-24 months. The key task of the convention is to ensure a total destruction of chemical stockpiles. The Soviet Union is prepared to start its shortly after the convention enters into force -- as soon as necessary technical preparations are completed.

The USSR also suggests handling another major problem -- a package of measures for preventing the functioning and for liquidating facilities which produce chemical weapons.

The Soviet statement lays particular emphasis on the following: The Soviet-proposed measures for ending the production of and eliminating chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production should be carried out under strict control, including international on-site inspections.

Preventing the further proliferation of chemical weapons would also contribute to the cause of peace. The Soviet position is such that a multilateral agreement should be reached to ban the transfer of chemical weapons to any other party and their deployment on the territory of other states.

The Soviet Union justly expects from the United States and its NATO allies a serious, businesslike approach to this, most vital, problem facing mankind.

'EUROPEAN ASPECT' VITAL TO DISARMAMENT

PM101207 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Candidate of Military Sciences Major General (Reserve) F. Gontar article under the rubric "Military Scientists' Opinion": "Cutting the Gordian Knot; European Aspect of the Nuclear Problem"]

[Text] The 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put forward a range of principled foreign policy initiatives aimed at ending the nuclear arms race on earth, preventing it in space, and building trust as an inalienable component of relations among states.

The core of the Soviet proposals is a specific program running up to the end of this century for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide. The problem of eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe has an important place in this program. This is conditioned by the fact that major groupings of NATO and Warsaw Pact troops equipped with medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons are concentrated there. On the European Continent the United States alone, not counting Britain and France, has over 7,000 nuclear charges. The bulk of them (more than 5,000 units) are sited in the FRG.

Contrary to the European peoples' security interests and commonsense arguments, 108 U.S. Pershing-2 medium-range nuclear ballistic missile launchers were hurriedly deployed in the FRG at the end of last year. Series production of these missiles (on the basis of three units for each launcher) is continuing in the United States on Pentagon orders.

As things stood at the end of last year 96 U.S. nuclear ground-launched cruise missiles [GLCM] had been deployed in Britain, 32 in Italy, and 16 in Belgium. The first of the 96 missiles, whose deployment was previously planned to begin only in 1987, have been shipped to the FRG from overseas.

In all, the Pentagon plans to site 464 nuclear GLCM's in the West European NATO countries by the end of 1988. And this despite the fact that the territory of the West European countries is already literally chockablock with nuclear weapons and has been turned into an enormous nuclear powder keg. Their elimination is a prime task in strengthening not only European, but international security.

In order to prevent a further raising of the level of nuclear missile confrontation in Europe, the Soviet Union proposed -- during the new Soviet-U.S. talks last March -- the declaration of a joint moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

However, the U.S. side refused to accept this moratorium on farfetched pretexts. Yet the Soviet Union, showing good will, reinforced its proposal with unilateral action, ending the deployment of medium-range missiles and the buildup of other retaliatory measures in Europe as of April 1985. The continuing siting of U.S. missiles in the West European countries can only complicate the implementation of the joint accord on accelerating work at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

The fact that militarist U.S. and NATO circles are blocking in every possible way the constructive resolution of the problem of lowering the level of nuclear missile confrontation in Europe is attested by a number of facts.

Speaking at the December (1985) NATO defense minister's session, Pentagon chief C. Weinberger announced the U.S. Senate decision to allocate $200 million for the construction in West European countries of the necessary infrastructure to expedite the continued deployment of U.S. nuclear GLCM's on their territories. This shows that the Pentagon is planning to dig in long and hard on the European Continent with its first-strike missiles.

The accelerated deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe is of exceptional concern to the European peoples. They recognize that these missiles are one of the most dangerous factors destabilizing the military-political situation and raising the nuclear confrontation level on the continent. This problem has been discussed for many years now. Meanwhile, security conditions in Europe continue to worsen. It is time to stop this development of events and cut this Gordian knot.

In order to improve the situation in Europe, reduce the threshold of military confrontation, and remove the risk of the outbreak of war in the region, the Soviet Union proposes in the first phase to implement its program, that is, to take the first radical step over the next 5-8 years, starting in 1986. In this phase a decision on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles -- both ballistic and cruise -- in the European zone will be reached and implemented. This will require the development of appropriate procedures which will stipulate the amounts, timetables, and places in which these missiles will be destroyed and the means for reliable, including international, on-site verification [kontrol] and inspection [inspektsiya]. The United States must pledge not to ship its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries and Britain and France must pledge not to build up their corresponding nuclear arms. And if the first phase of nuclear disarmament applies to the Soviet Union and the United States, this is merely because -- as the U.S. side stated at the Geneva summit -- they must set a good example to the other nuclear powers.

It is striking that the mass media in the United States and certain other NATO countries are claiming that the Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles in Europe repeat the "zero option" once put forward by the U.S. President. This is deliberate disinformation. Reagan's "zero option" envisaged that the Soviet Union would have to destroy its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone, but in the east of the country. Moreover, it did not rule out the possibility of the American's transferring medium-range missiles to their allies and building up the corresponding arms of Britain and France. Thus, the U.S.-style "zero option" and the Soviet proposal for the complete elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone have nothing in common. The Soviet proposal is a great and bold step along the road of completely ridding the continent of nuclear weapons without damaging either side's security interests.

In the second phase, which will start not later than 1990 and last for 5-7 years, the other nuclear powers, including Britain and France, will join in the nuclear disarmament process.

Initially, they would pledge to freeze their nuclear arms and not to hold any on the territories of other countries. In this period the Soviet Union and the United States would continue the reductions agreed on in the first phase and implement further measures to eliminate their medium-range nuclear arms while simultaneously freezing their tactical nuclear means everywhere.

This nuclear arms reduction procedure is proposed on the basis that British, French, and Chinese leaders have repeatedly stated that their countries would be prepared to join in the nuclear disarmament process only when the Soviet Union and the United States substantially reduced their nuclear arsenals. That is why the Soviet plan envisages that the other countries with these weapons would embark on nuclear disarmament in the second phase, after the Soviet Union and the United States reduced the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories; not just substantially, but by 50 percent. Moreover, according to the Soviet proposal the reduction of our countries' nuclear arsenals would begin with the destruction of tactical nuclear weapons, while those arms which they themselves call strategic would be destroyed only in the third phase (1995-1999), with the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals being completed simultaneously.

The Soviet proposal to eliminate medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe has clearly annoyed Pentagon strategists. Striving at all costs to weaken its attraction, they are issuing various fabrications. They claim, for instance, that the Soviet Union, having scrapped its medium-range missiles in the European zone, could rapidly transfer medium-range missiles there from the Asian part of the country. But, first, Soviet medium-range missiles are not in the east to be transported hither and thither, but primarily, because the United States has nuclear means capable of reaching Soviet territory in that region. And second, if I may put the question to the authors of this "argument," how much time would the Pentagon need to transfer Pershing-2's from the United States to Europe using transport aircraft? So there is no logic in this type of "proof." We are faced merely with a desire to bring the resolution of such an important question for security in Europe to a standstill on any pretext.

In the West people are discussing the question of whether the Soviet-U.S. accord reached at the Geneva summit on a mutually binding solution to the problem of nuclear and space arms remains in force. The Soviet Union, as follows from M.S. Gorbachev's statement, firmly proceeds on the basis that the reduction and subsequent elimination of nuclear arms are only possible given a joint Soviet and U.S. refusal to create [sozdaniye], test, and deploy space strike arms. This is not an arbitrary linkage of two different questions. It is a question of their objective, organic, and material interconnection, which cannot be severed. Instead of spending immense resources on creating [sozdaniye] space strike arms that are extremely dangerous to mankind and which could allegedly make nuclear weapons unnecessary, is it not more sensible to destroy and ultimately, eliminate nuclear weapons? Our country is proposing just such a course.

It should be stressed that the Soviet program attaches great importance to the problem of ending nuclear tests. That is why the Soviet Union has extended its moratorium on all nuclear explosions through 31 March this year and urged the United States to join the moratorium. A complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests would be an important practical step toward their elimination.

Speaking of the importance of the European aspect of the nuclear problem, M.S. Gorbachev stressed: "If it were possible, without stalling or burdening the work with other problems, to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles on our continent, we would probably have unraveled one of the complex knots of current world politics and cleared the way considerably for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons and subsequently, their complete elimination." Therein lies the essence of the USSR's constructive position.

SOVIET INITIATIVE 'SHATTERS' MILITARY THREAT THESIS

PM051015 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Jan 86 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Doctor of Military Sciences Lieutenant General M. Kiryan article under the rubric "Policy of Peace Versus Policy of War": "In the Interests of the Peoples' Security"]

[Text] The package of major new foreign policy initiatives put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and above all, the concrete program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere by the year 2000, aroused a tremendous response throughout the world. Soviet people, our friends abroad, and progressive mankind regard the statement as a very important, crucial document in the struggle of the CPSU and the Soviet State for a lasting, universal peace and as a vivid expression of the Soviet Union's readiness and determination to actively develop and strengthen the "spirit of Geneva." The Soviet Union, the USSR Supreme Soviet's appeal to the U.S. Congress notes, has for the first time in the history of the nuclear age put forward a detailed, concrete program, with precise calculations as to time, for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere.

The statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general sectetary of the CPSU Central Committee, confirms again and again that the course of peace and disarmament is the pivot of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State. This document of historic significance endows the party's programmatic tenets on its international policy with concrete content and fully accords with the draft new edition of the CPSU Program -- the party's main theoretical and political document.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program expresses in its entirety the Soviet concept of establishing peace on earth and formulates clearly and specifically the fundamentals of the party's international policy. This document demonstrates our party's broad approach to international affairs and its ability to look reality in the face without prejudice, to assess events objectively, and to react flexibly to the demands of the moment.

This broad, realistic, considered approach is particularly necessary in conditions where a very dangerous trend has emerged in the policy of the major capitalist states. The practical actions of imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, cast an increasingly clear light on the nature of this policy: social revenge on the basis of achieving military superiority over socialism, the suppression of progressive liberation movements by force, and the maintenance of international tension at a level permitting its initiators to justify in the public's eyes the creation of more and more new types of mass destruction weapons and the militarization of space.

The Soviet Union resolutely opposes this policy and the attempts to forcibly halt and reverse the course of history. In relations with the capitalist countries the CPSU proceeds on the basis that the historical dispute between the two opposing social systems can and must be resolved by peaceful means. Our party firmly and consistently upholds the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. The policy of peaceful coexistence presupposes, first and foremost, the renunciation of war and the use of the threat of force as a means of resolving disputes and presupposes overcoming such disputes through talks.

With a view to ensuring lasting peace and security for the peoples, the CPSU and the Soviet State do everything necessary to break the vicious circle of the arms race and take every opportunity to bring about a change for the better in the course of international events.

The Soviet Union proposes a comprehensive package of measures to close all avenues of the arms race -- in space or on earth, for nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons. Our proposals on this score are well known.

At the same time, the Soviet Union is adopting appropriate measures to ensure the reliable defense of socialist gains and strengthen the country's defense capability. Here too, there are specific warnings. Thus, the draft new edition of the CPSU Program points out: While the danger exists of imperialism unleashing aggression, military conflicts, and provocations of various kinds, unremitting attention must be devoted to strengthening the USSR's defense might and reinforcing its security. The CPSU, the document goes on to say, will make every effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces are at a level such as to exclude strategic superiority for the forces of imperialism.

The establishment of military-strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc was an historic achievement for socialism. It consolidated the position of the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces and thwarted the hopes of imperialism's aggressive circles for securing victory in a world nuclear war. The preservation of this equilibrium, the draft new edition of the CPSU Program notes, is the major guarantee of ensuring peace and international security.

Our position on this question was set forth at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva: The Soviet Union is against changes in the strategic balance. The U.S. President was told quite clearly that the Soviet Union will find a reply to the U.S. Administration's attempts to obtain military superiority. It will be an effective response; quick enough and probably less costly than the U.S. program.

However, aggressive imperialist circles, especially U.S. circles, which are in the grip of a desire for world domination, are unwilling to reconcile themselves to military-strategic parity. Fabricating and exploiting the myths about a "Soviet military threat" and their own supposed laggardness in the military sphere, the U.S. Administration steps up efforts to attempt to achieve strategic superiority. Here the extension of the arms race to space is brought to the fore. The United States is embarking on the implementation of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), which in effect means the siting of strike weapons in space. It is consequently a question not of defense, but of the creation of conditions under which the United States, or so they think, would be able to attempt a first nuclear strike without fear of retaliation. It is a question of inserting an arms system into space which could give its possessors the illusion of invulnerability and be a motive encouraging the unleashing of aggression.

Hopes of invulnerability and impunity are, of course, unfounded. The possibility of creating an "absolutely impenetrable space shield" is precisely nil. Nonetheless, the work on these weapons in itself constitutes a threat to the existing military equilibrium and increases the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. That is why the Soviet Union and the world public actively oppose the space militarization plans.

With a view to attempting to take the heat out of the antimilitarist actions of the planet's peace-loving forces, the U.S. Administration is making desperate efforts to conceal from the peoples the true aims and nature of its SDI program, making out that strike weapons in space are designed to make nuclear arms unnecessary and that the elimination of nuclear weapons can be approached through the creation of qualitatively new arms and their deployment in space.

But building a policy on this calculation is an irremediable mistake. If strike weapons are placed in space, the nuclear arms race, far from being stopped, will develop with unprecedented force and proceed in the most dangerous directions.

The Soviet Union believes that the most radical solution to the problem is the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere.

The world public now awaits a concrete response from the U.S. Administration to the Soviet Union's large-scale peace initiatives. But official Washington's initial reaction to them itself causes involuntary alarm. While welcoming the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and expressing the hope that the Soviet proposals are a useful next step in the nuclear arms reduction process, U.S. President R. Reagan completely avoids the question of fundamental importance -- that of preventing the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. Nor does the U.S. President touch on this question at all in his statement in connection with the fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms which has begun in Geneva.

Moreover, other official Washington spokesman, in particular Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, express themselves clearly and quite definitely on this problem. He stated frankly that there will be no shifts in the U.S. position on the SDI program. The United States will continue to implement SDI, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz echoes him.

At the same time, the Soviet side has said extremely clearly that nuclear arms reduction is only possible given a mutual renunciation by the Soviet Union and the United States of the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms and that the creation of space strike weapons will eliminate hopes for nuclear arms reduction on earth. Conversely, preventing the arms race from spreading to space means removing the obstacle to deep nuclear arms reductions.

Putting a padlock on the resolution of the problem of space means not wanting to stop the arms race on earth. Not for nothing are the supporters of the nuclear arms race also zealous supporters of the "star wars" program. These are two sides of the same policy, a policy hostile to people's interests.

The imperialist adherents of this policy are far from understanding that mankind is at a crucial stage in the new space age. That it is time to renounce the Stone Age way of thinking, when the main task was to provide yourself with a bigger stick or a heavier stone. What is needed now are new approaches, a new way of political thinking, a keener sense of responsibility for the peoples' fate. The Soviet Union's material and intellectual potential is sufficiently high to ensure the possibility of creating any weapons if we are forced to do so. But as M.S. Gorbachev's statement says, we are fully aware of our responsibility to present and future generations. It is our profound conviction that we must enter the third millennium not with the "star wars" program, but with large-scale projects for the peaceful exploration of space using all of mankind's forces.

The Soviet Union is resolutely opposed to the siting of weapons in space. It also proceeds on the basis that it is impermissible to submit to the elemental forces of the nuclear race. This idea permeates the entire Soviet program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. In the context of the measures put forward, the Soviet Union has adopted an important decision and extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions for 3 months.

This moratorium has been in force since 6 August 1985. The U.S. ruling circles have had enough time to join it.

But official representatives did not take that step and have still not done so. Moreover U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has stated: "We consider it important for us to continue tests according to plan" with a view to modernizing strategic arms. By testing more and more new nuclear devices, the U.S. side continues the pursuit of the impossible dream of military superiority. This is a futile and dangerous policy. A policy unworthy of the level of civilization which modern society has reached.

The Soviet Union's new large-scale peace initiatives are based on the principle of equal security for all. They are not detrimental to anyone's interests. They contain no attempts to outwit or beat the other side.

By proposing a concrete, phased plan for the reduction and ultimate total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere by the year 2000 and calling for the nonmilitarization of space, the elimination of chemical weapons, and the coordinated reduction of conventional arms and armed forces, the Soviet Union shatters the false thesis of the imperialist ideologists about the "Soviet military threat."

The Soviet Union has never set itself the goal of achieving military-strategic superiority. It has followed and follows today the Leninist course of peace and peaceful coexistence, which is determined by the socialist social system and our morality and philosophy. The Soviet Union consistently advocates the renunciation of war as a means of resolving international questions and smooth, correct interstate relations based on true respect for international legal norms.

The Soviet proposals contain a just approach to present-day problems; they embrace all the means which make up the correlation of forces and they make it possible to take into account the volume of the nuclear threat which really exists for each side, regardless of how and from where the nuclear charges are delivered to their territory -- by missile or plane, from the other side's own territory or that of its allies.

In its policy our party is guided by the fact that, however great the threat to peace created by the policy of aggressive circles of imperialism, world war is not a fatal inevitability. The CPSU is approaching its 27th congress with a concrete program for further progress toward communism and for the struggle for peace and international security. Preventing war and protecting mankind against catastrophe -- it sees this as the historic mission of socialism and all the planet's progressive and peace-loving forces.

SOVIET, U.S. GENEVA DELEGATIONS HOLD PLENARY MEETING

LD141256 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 14 TASS -- The delegations from the Soviet Union and the United States to talks on nuclear and space arms held a plenary meeting here today.

CEMA SUCCESSES CITED AT PRESS CONFERENCE

LD181852 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Feb (TASS) -- The total national income of the CEMA countries in the years from 1981 to 1985 increased by 17-18 percent as compared to the period of the last 5-year plan, which means a substantial top of the indexes for the Western states, academician Oleg Bogomolov, the director of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System said. He spoke at the press conference today at the press center of the 27th CPSU Congress. Yuriy Kozhin, deputy minister of foreign trade of the USSR, Arnold Romanov, deputy chairman of the State Committee of the USSR for Sciences and Technology, and Vyacheslav Sychev, secretary of CEMA also took part in the conference.

Much data proving that the CEMA is the most dynamically developing group of countries in the world, with regard to economics, were given at the press conference. Within a 5-year period, the total extent of the foreign trade of the CEMA countries increased by 40 percent and the extent of their reciprocal trade within the framework of the council grew by 60 percent.

The labor productivity in the CEMA countries increased by 15 percent in the years from 1981 to 1985. Along with this, 90 percent of the increase in the output of industrial production in these countries has been insured by the growth in labor productivity.

It was noted at the press conference that the successful implementation of the CEMA comprehensive program of scientific and technological progress up to the year 2000 will be a powerful impulse for the further development of equal, reciprocally advantageous trade and economic links between the CEMA countries.

As to the structure of the reciprocal trade of CEMA countries, it was said at the press conference in the present 5-year period its improvement is planned, in particular in the direction of increase in the specific share of ready production, including machines and equipment, within the overall trade turn-over. At the present time, 40 percent of the total volume of trade within the framework of CEMA is accounted for by machinery and equipment. During the years 1986-1990, reciprocal supplies of high-level scientific equipment will grow at a fast rate: equipment for atomic power stations, flexible production systems, robot technology, and automated systems. It is planned to increase reciprocal supplies among the CEMA member countries of a wide variety of consumer goods, which will provide the possibility of satisfying consumers' demands for various products produced in the CEMA countries.

It was stressed at the press conference that the success of the CEMA member countries in economic development is of service, first and foremost, to the cause of further raising the standard of living of the working people in the CEMA countries.

VOSS RETURNS FROM WARSAW PARLIAMENTARY MEETING

PM181448 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Return to Moscow"]

[Text] A.E. Voss, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities and deputy chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group, returned to Moscow 15 February from Warsaw, where he took part in the consultative meeting of leaders of socialist countries' parliamentary groups. At the airport he was met by L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, and other officials.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD150026 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Feb 86

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by foreign affairs commentator Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, with political observer Nikolay Shishlin and commentator Pavel Kasparov]

[Excerpts] [Lavrentyev] Hello comrades. I would like to begin today's program which, as always, comprises replies to your letters, with a theme which is touched upon in the majority of the correspondences to some extent or another. It is the question of the search for a peaceful future for our planet and to the Soviet Union's efforts that are directly linked to this, and precisely aimed at the attainment of this noble aim. In our news bulletins we regularly report on what a great and positive response the Soviet proposals set out in Comrade Gorbachev's statement of 15 January are receiving in the world. Your letters also contain support for them, At the same time, a number of radio listeners -- Sergy Mikhailovich Pirev from Novosibirsk, Comrade Rodionov from (?Ukhtomsk), and others -- justifiably ask: Why has the U.S. Administration so far given no specific reply to our new proposal? What is the motive for its silence? I asked political observer Nikolay Shishlin to reply to this and to certain other questions connected with this topic. Over to you, Nikolay Vladimirovich.

[Shishlin] First, it must be noted that, naturally, the comprehensive plan for peace and disarmament which was put forward by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary in mid-January is a wide-ranging, all-embracing plan and it is, in itself, so many-sided that it requires some study. In this respect, the references which the U.S. Administration is making for the need to reflect upon and attentively analyze the set of Soviet proposals are justified to some extent. But I simultaneously understand the question why, nonetheless, there has not yet been a specific reply in the course of almost a month. On the one hand the United States, as if it already had prepared a reply, is now conducting consultations with various countries in Europe and Asia so that it can take its final shape. As you know, Nitze, the special assistant to the President and the secretary of state on disarmament, is in Europe for this purpose, and, in the same capacity, Washington's highly placed emissary Rowny is in Asia.

Well, naturally the results of the consultations will reveal the details, but the second feature characteristic of Washington's reflections today is that both political figures and the U.S. press in my opinion, excel more in questioning the Soviet initiatives that in working on any counter movements of their own for the sake of working out a reasonable compromise. Well, there are countless questions on this score, although the answer to many of them already has been given in the statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent interview to the French newspaper L'HUMANITE.

But what question in particular so they like to ask in the United States with regard to, say, the issue of halting nuclear tests? It must be stated that time is passing and not much remains until 31 March, the expiration date of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on conducting nuclear explosions. As before, the United States is excelling in all kinds of questions. They stated at the beginning that since it is possible to introduce a unilateral moratorium, than it ought to be a subject of talks. But the Soviet proposals which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made in mid-January speak of the Soviet Union's preparedness to enter urgently into talks with the United States and Great Britain on the question of halting all nuclear tests.

The United States also asks this question: What kind of verification will there be? The Soviet Union is, in essence, prepared to introduce comprehensive verification, even going as far as on-site verification. So, these questions in themselves are not just the consequence of an attempt to somehow delve into, to refelct upon, this comprehensive plan for peace and disarmament. In my opinion, these questions are more characteristic of an unpreparedness on the U.S. side to change the political landmarks and to switch over on a lasting basis to a quest to achieve an accord with the Soviet Union.

Washington in now stating that the reply being worked on, which already has essentially been prepared in some form, will be of a positive nature. An then, as a matter of fact, the world will see that the United States is prepared to follow the direction of a curtailment of the arms race on earth. Nonetheless, at the same time as it speaks of the positive nature of this forthcoming reply, there are still doubts when one considers both the U.S. military programs and its blind adherence to its "star wars" plans, which literally is manifested daily on all political levels. Thus I believe that our radio listeners' concern that the Americans are delaying in their response is a justified concern.

[Lavrentyev] Nikolay Vladimirovich, our radio listeners are interested to learn whether the political climate in the United States changed at all after Geneva.

[Shishlin] That is not an easy question, of course, since it is not a simple matter to measure the political climate, especially in the United States where it is subject to all kinds of short-term fluctuations. But somehow or other, if you soberly evaluate the situation, I believe certain changes of a favorable nature have been taking place within the United States' political climate since Geneva. Precisely since Geneva, since the summit meeting with the Soviet leader, President Reagan has been receiving very tolerable results in public opinion polls as a man who, in the eyes of Americans, seems to be acquiring a skill of communicating with the Soviet Union, the skill of conducting a dialogue with the Soviet leaders. I don't know on what the U.S. evaluations are based since, overall, it still must be said frankly that the Soviet-American dialogue is developing with difficulty and that, in this respect, 1986 will be a year of serious testing, a year of serious examination of the words and statements which have been made. However, words and statements will no longer be sufficient to reach and evaluation of the true state of both the political climate in the United States and of the degree of U.S. preparedness to reach a compromise with the Soviet Union.

In talking about the political climate in the United States. I would like to draw attention to a number of factors. The prominent U.S. senator, Kennedy, was in our country recently. He made an appearance on our central television. He met scientists and was received by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. The frame of mind which Kennedy expressed is not just the frame of mind of this specific senator. It is the frame of mind of a quite influential part of the contemporary political elite in the United States, which believes that it is essential to overcome the tension between the Soviet Union and the United States, to overcome the acute confrontation, and to attempt to find a solution for some of the quite complicated problems regarding the curtailment of the arms race. Incidentally, you probably noticed that the same Senator Kennedy is a convinced opponent of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that more than 400 representatives of U.S. business circles were in Moscow near the end of last year. This experience also is an indication of a certain change not only in the economic climate -- it is unfortunately, quite persistently cold, in fact -- between the Soviet Union and the United States. But it is an indication of the political mood, in general, in the United States.

I would not underestimate those steps, modest as they may be, which are being taken in developing cultural links between the USSR and the United States, in the enrichment and intensification of scientific exchanges, and sporting links. All of this is, of course, useful. All of this is working toward a change in the climate.

But, somehow or other, we must soberly take account of the fact that we are dealing with peripheral questions thus far. The central questions, questions of security, questions of the curtailment of the arms race on earth and the prevention of its transfer to space, are still blocked by the U.S. position. And, if you take a look at how they are trying to form the United States budget for the coming 1987 fiscal year, we once again see a growth in military expenditure, a growth in military programs all in the same sensitive directions, including in the direction of the implementation of the "star wars" plans. So, in replying to this question of changes in the U.S. political climate since Geneva, one must be quite cautious. There are some small shifts, some changes are taking place. But these small shifts and changes are not yet of a radical nature.

[Lavrentyev] And finally, the last question which worries very many people. What is to be expected from the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

[Shishlin] First of all, we must take clear account of the fact that there is an accord on a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. A visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States is intended for 1986. And in 1987 the Soviet Union is prepared to receive here President Ronald Reagan of the United States. That is the first thing. There is indeed an accord.

The second thing — the time of the visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the United States has not yet been agreed upon. It is still the subject of diplomatic procedures, and the date of the visit has not been officially set. It is quite obvious that if there is no movement in the main aspects of world politics, if certain accords between the Soviet Union and the United States are not attained on the key problem of the curtailment of the arms race on earth and the prevention of its transfer to space, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his conversation with Senator Kennedy, the summit meeting itself becomes meaningless. This is a statement of the political realities which confront us in 1986. It is an expression of the degree of responsibility with which the Soviet Union approaches both Soviet-U.S. relations as such and the summit meetings which ought to be the motor, the engine to help a smoothing-out of relations to progress, and with which it approaches the development of peaceful cooperation for the good of the Soviet and U.S. peoples and for the good of universal security.

[Lavrentyev] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Pochuvalov of Perm enquires about the state of Soviet-Argentinian relations, What, he asks, did the recent visit to our country by Dante Caputo. Argentina's minister of foreign relations and worship, do for their development? By way of reply to this question, we present an interview granted by Dante Caputo to our correspondent Anselmo Sebtien:

[Begin recording in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation] The end of this visit to the Soviet Union is a moment at which to evaluate it, and this evaluation is most certainly a positive one. Our visit occured in an atmosphere of exceptional hospitality and cordiality, says the Argentinian minister. Although differences exist between our countries as regards our sociopolitical systems, this cannot prevent us from maintaining fruitful contacts in various fields. Our visit is typical in that, in addition to the existing diplomatic and trade links, it has helped extend relations into the political sphere.

In this connection, Dante Caputo goes on, I would like to stress that political relations are being established on the basis of complete agreement on such important questions as disarmament, detente, and peace.

The peace plan set forth by Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January this year is seen by us as a highly positive one, the Argentinian minister of foreign relations stresses. We regard it as a step forward in the cause of ensuring peace and security for all peoples. For its part, Argentina is striving to make a contribution to this process. Jointly with five other states it has proposed an initiative calling for an end to the arms race and nuclear tests. So we and the Soviet Union are moving in the same direction in our approach to international problems.

Dwelling on the development of bilateral ties between our countries, Dante Caputo said that a very important document had been signed, an agreement on the sale of grain to the USSR over a 5-year period, as well as an agreement on cultural and scientific cooperation.

I would like to mention another very interesting detail, says Dante Caputo: The decision by both countries to publish, in both Moscow and Buenos Aires, a book about the centenary of relations between us. [end recording]

[Lavrentyev] Listener Nikolay Sergeyevich Rodionov from Vitebsk, pensioner Avdotiya Sergeyevna Mitina, from the town of Yefremov in Tula Oblast, and many others are interested in an explanation for the present unfriendly campaign of anti-Sovietism in the French press. Commentator Pavel Kasparov, who worked as our correspondent in Paris, replies:

[Kasparov] There is clearly no need to explain that anti-Sovietism in France, as in other capitalist countries of the world, came into the world literally the day after the victory of Great October. All the ferocity and hatred of the power of capital toward the power of the proletariat, socialist power, were united almost focally in this phenomenon. At the beginning, anti-Sovietism was what is called frontal. On gigantic posters of European cities, including Paris, there was an illustration of a terrible, ragged peasant with a bloody knife in his teeth inspiring genuine horror in passers-by. An inscription on the poster read: Here he is -- the Bolshevik. Fear him!

After this, anti-Soviet propaganda became much more subtle. The French no longer used the Bolshevik bandit to intimidate, but constantly repeated that with the coming of the new power Russia had allegedly been completely deprived of its historical heritage, culture and art and that the country was allegedly living according to some absurd laws which were incomprehensible to the rest of mankind. By the way, the thesis of what is called the absurdity of Soviet laws has not been written off even today. It is essentially precisely here that the present campaign of accusations addressed toward the Soviet Union on alleged human rights in our country has its roots. Considerable efforts to fan the flames of this transparently false campaign are made, too, by certain political forces of France where, incidentally, many so-called defense committees of various kinds created by renegades of every hue have taken root. Often the French also come up with stories in the style of James Bond declaring, for example, all Soviet diplomats, trade representatives or journalists in France to be spies who do nothing else but hunt for advanced Western technology or the military secrets of the republic.

Here we have come to yet another thesis enjoying wide currency among anti-Soviets both in the West as a whole and in France: the Soviet military threat.

Our country is purposely shown there as a crafty colossus armed to the teeth which is just waiting for an advantageous moment to attack the civilized Western world. This kind of propaganda falsehood can be found today in practically any of the country's right-wing newspapers.

Moreover, the theme is beginning to appear more and more frequently in programs of the state radio and television. Not long ago, for example, French television showed the program called Confronted with War in which the USSR was depicted as an aggressive power ready at any moment to unleash its tank columns on France. However, its authors put so many blatant lies in the program that, as the majority of viewers testified, they became obvious. But you see, someone might go and believe these tales. They are especially dangerous for young French people who, for the most part, are not familiar with the lessons of World War II. And from this point of view, we should not underestimate the influence of the anti-Soviet campaigns which, day in, day out, are being waged in the West, including in France.

The campaign which developed literally a few days ago in the French press, on the radio and television about the alleged appearance of thousands of unemployed people in the USSR can be called the latest specimen of unimaginable calumny against our country. The aim of the campaign is the same as that of other propagandist attacks against our country -- to discredit socialism and its real achievements in the eyes of the French. At the same time, hiding or distorting the truth about the Soviet Union and its peace-loving foreign policy is becoming ever more difficult.

In this sense, the visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to France and his speeches there on national television and to parliamentarians and also his recent replies to the questions of the French Communist newspaper HUMANITE, is of extremely great importance. It has historically come about, stressed Comrade Gorbachev in a conversation with the political director of the newspaper, that Soviet-French relations have traditionally been based on mutual affection and respect of the peoples for each other. The appearance now of stubborn efforts by certain cirlces in France to evoke enmity toward and distrust of the Soviet Union in the French and create a false picture of our country and its policy is all the more incomprehensible to us. We are grateful, said Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in conclusion, to French Communists and to HUMANITE for speaking out against anti-Sovietism.

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM161841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov "International Review"]

[Text] The World Is Changing

You do not have to look back very far sometimes to sense the reality of the changes taking place in the international atmosphere. Both in the West and the East today people are talking about the possibility of restoring detente. Not with a sense of elation, but with a certain optimism. Its source is obvious. It lies in the whole package of large-scale USSR peace initiatives which the world press is calling the Soviet "comprehensive peace program." Our party is taking this program confidently toward its 27th congress. Its essense was expressed with the utmost clarity in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Mankind has been offered a realistic prospect of freeing our planet from nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000.

In reply to L'HUMANITE's question about whether new signs of the restoration of detente in international relations have been noticed since the Geneva summit, M.S. Gorbachev said:

"Yes, some signs are beginning to appear. And it is not only and not so much a question of individual shifts in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations: They are too limited, peripheral, and do not affect the fundamental questions. Instead a certain change in the political atmosphere is already being felt. And that has engendered in the peoples of many countries a hope and belief in the possibility of returning to detente, ending the insane arms race, and developing normal peaceful international cooperation. This is already something real and politically significant."

On the one hand the Soviet Union's dynamic and purposeful foreign policy is causing confusion in the ranks of the cold war supporters, and on the other it is forcing even convinced opponents of socialism to take a new look at what is happening in the world. At a recent plenum of the Communist Party of the United States of America Central Committee, the U.S. Communists' leader Gus Hall said that since the summit, changes had occurred in the leading U.S. political and monopolistic circles, which have been reflected in the Reagan administration. Those circles, G. Hall noted, remain anti-communist and anti-Soviet in outlook. But their assessment of the balance of world forces has changed. Now you can see a certain realism based on their assessment of the lack of success of the 8-year-old cold war policy.

Serious opposition to the arms race program and the militarization of space can also be seen in the U.S. Congress. For example, D. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, urged the administration to respond positively to the Soviet leader's statement and, in particular, to support the USSR's proposal for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The House recently resumed the discussion of a resolution supporting a test ban treaty submitted by 208 congressmen last October.

Sober-minded Americans are sounding the alarm. They demand that the administration "not miss the opportunity," that it respond constructively to the Soviet proposals, and that it not complicate the entirely attainable accords on a mutual reduction of the nuclear arsenals by programming the arms race for decades to come. For example, Congressmen G. Brown and L. AuCoin recently demanded that spending on antisatellite weapons (ASAT) be excluded from the new budget. Representatives of the public organization Program for Peace and International Security have written in THE NEW YORK TIMES: "If our children's future is made dependent on an uncontrolled arms race and space weapons systems causing global instability, a terrible explosion may occur in which the whole world will burn."

The feelings of sober-minded Americans are echoed by many West Europeans' thoughts. H. Scheer, a leader to the Social Democratic Party of Germany's Bundestag faction, recently sharply criticized the Bonn Government's support for "star wars" and the continuation of nuclear tests. Commenting on the USSR's proposals, he said: "Instead of making use of this real opportunity to ban nuclear weapons tests, the FRG Government is doing the very opposite. Whoever approves of SDI must logically also block the banning of nuclear tests."

Is all this being taken into account in the White House during the formulation of a reply to the Soviet initiatives? The United States is now openly talking about an "intensified internal struggle on the important foreign and defense policy problems" which, as the PHILADELHPIA INQUIRER writes, is "vexing the upper echelons of the Reagan administration at a time when the President is facing the most serious political challenge from the USSR."

This struggle between the "hawks" and the "pragmatists" for influence over the President began back in the period of preparations for the summit meeting, as demonstrated by the "leak" to the press of the regrettable "Weinberger letter." It has now become more acute, particularly after the President expressed his gratitude to the Soviet leader for the new disarmament proposals.

These political battles within the Washington hierarchy explain to a considerable extent the reasons for the very long silence on the new Soviet initiatives -- after all, it is today exactly 1 month since M.S. Gorbachev's statement was published in the press and there has still been no reply to it from across the ocean. The U.S. Administration explains this delay by saying that as a preliminary move Washington had decided to "consult with its allies and friends." For that reason in particular P. Nitze, the administration's main expert in the disarmament sphere, toured the West European countries. He visited Bonn, Paris, London, and Brussels, where he conducted a special session of the NATO Council. General Rowny, another expert, went on the same mission to Tokyo and... Beijing.

While Washington is preparing its answer, the U.S. press is in its own way "formulating" the content of that reply. If these commentaries are to be believed, Washington is by no means burning with the desire to work at freeing the planet from nuclear weapons together with the nonmilitarization of space. Washington regards SDI like the Hindu "sacred cow" and is striving to impose this attitude on everyone. At the same time it is trying to confuse the issue by hinting that the Soviet Union has become "more flexible" in its approach to the problem of the nonmilitarization of space. However, the USSR has made it clear that the implementation of the "star wars" concept will nullify the hopes of reducing nuclear armaments on earth.

Judging by articles in the U.S. press, people are not adverse to hedging with various conditions the solution of the question of eliminating the USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. On the one hand their commentaries advise Britain and France not to agree to freeze their nuclear forces during the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. And on the other they demand the unilateral reduction of the corresponding Soviet weapons in Asia, which are a counterweight to the U.S. nuclear potential existing there.

Is there really a blockage here -- on a question on which there are "points of contact," as noted in Geneva? This alarming thought is suggested, in particular, by the latest revelations of U.S. General Rogers, commander in chief of NATO's armed forces. "The destruction of medium-range weapons would mean," he stated, "that the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles will disappear from Europe, in other words, the very weapons linking European and U.S. security." How about that then!

So perhaps Washington's envoys who toured Western Europe and the Asian countries were interested not so much in finding out their allies' opinion on the Soviet initiatives as in imposing on them their own opinion of the whole package of Soviet disarmament proposals?

Among the leaders of the West European countries and other states allied to the United States, there is still no single opinion on the new Soviet initiatives. Both there and across the ocean the struggle is underway between the supporters of accords with the USSR leading to a nuclear-free 21st century and those who strive to perpetuate the cold war and the arms race. Nevertheless, in Europe, the cradle of detente, the sensible ones prevail. This cannot be ignored in the White House. There have been quite a few statements from there on the desire for peace. But practical actions show that the inertia in U.S. political thinking has not been overcome.

Yes, the West is now facing another "moment of truth." It must give a clear answer to the USSR's proposal: scrap all the weapons of mass destruction, both nuclear and chemical, in the world and enter a nuclear-free 21st century together. The very fate of mankind and of civilization on earth depends on that answer. And the leaders of the United States and other Western powers must answer first of all to their own peoples.

Washington "Zombies"

Those who saw the fine movie based on G. Greene's novel "The Comedians" will recall how the Tontons Macoutes, -- bodyguards of the Haitian dictator Duvalier senior, steal the corpse of the leader of the opposition. Papa Doc, as he was called, practised voodoo, a cult whose ministers have the ability to bring the dead back to life by turning them into zombies -- their will-less slaves. This sophisticated form of reprisal against the opponents of the harshest dictatorship that has ever existed in Central America was, of course, purely symbolic. In real life the terrible atrocities in Haiti were committed not by zombies reanimated by witch doctors but by those "living dead" who were elevated to the rank of "President for Life" at the will of U.S. monopolies and against the will of the Haitian people. At first this was President Francois Duvalier, who ruled from 1957 to 1971, and, after his death, it was his son Baby Doc, Jean-Claude Duvalier, president until 8 February this year. This country was not only horrendously poor. It was called the "poorest prison in the world." Therein lies the very essence of the bloody dictatorial regime, which for almost 30 years enjoyed official Washington's unfailing protection and assistance, including military assistance. The patrons of "human rights" in the White House and the U.S. Congress looked quietly on while the zombies under their control drank Haitians' blood and annihilated all dissenters. The terrible statistic that 1 prisoner in 10 died from torture in the first 5 days of captivity in Duvalier's jails, and that 80 percent of the rest died within 2 years from torture, starvation, and disease was well-known in Washington. But it was consistently asserted there that "there are no political prisoners in Haiti," which was a lie to Americans and the whole world, because Duvalier's butcher regime met all the main indicators of "democracy" U.S.-style: first, it was totally anticommunist, second, it was 100-percent pro-American, and third, it ensured the U.S. monopolies full freedom to make a fortune from the Haitians' sufferings and to rob them with impunity.

Everything comes to an end, however, even the people's long suffering. Sooner or later dictators throughout the ages have choked on the blood that they have shed. Such a moment came to Haiti, too. Actions against the dictatorial regime continued unceasingly from January 1986. The effects of the people's anger were not hard to predict: The "convenient" dictatorship next door to the United States would be swept away. And then his "own people" or, as the Western press more candidly puts it, the U.S. Embassy in Port-au-Prince "persuaded" the dictator to leave the island. To that end the United States conducted "delicate negotiations" with France, which announced its readiness to grant Baby Doc temporary asylum, and assigned a special aircraft of the U.S. Air Force and 25 guards to quietly take him near Switzerland, where the dictator's millions had been set aside "for a rainy day."

At the same time, they prepared an "orderly change of power," a "new government." Made up of whom? The very same "zombies" -- military men trained in the United States and by American instructors in Haiti, men who made a career under Duvalier senior. Just like the French saying: "Plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose." What is most important is that all three indicators of adherence to American-style "democracy" are preserved.

How long will Washington go on gambling on political corpses and imposing them on the peoples as "healthy political forces"?

Can history really have taught nothing to the U.S. ruling circles, who still look on the whole world as their patrimony, assuming that from their Washington hilltop they can dictate to the peoples what system to choose, what government to elect, and what course to follow? In fact, this is the very essence of the fashionable new "neoglobalism doctrine" which has now been declared in Washington, one of whose first victims was the revolution in Grenada.

On 20 February, President Reagan will visit Grenada. What will he see on that island with a total area of only 112 square miles and a population of 110,000, occupied on 25 October 1983 by 6,000 "crusaders" in American uniform? What is the value of the "freedom" and "democracy" they brought on their bayonets?

Between 1979 and 1983 the Bishop government managed to cut unemployment in the country from 49 to 12 percent. Now approximately one-half of the able-bodied population is unemployed again.

In 1982, 37 cents of every dollar spent by the government went toward education and medical services. Some 50,000 people received free milk. Many such figures could be cited. Now that is all a thing of the past. The pro-American party which has come to power in Grenada, using dollars received from the United States in the course of "free elections," has cancelled virtually all social programs. Grenada is now ruled by the same old "zombies," brought back to political life by Washington in the name of the triumph of "free enterprise." They are obedient and malleable and their first gesture was to break off diplomatic relations with the socialist countries and swear loyalty to primitive anticommunism. Will they last long? Was it worth "reviving" them?

The gamble on political corpses whom the White House declares to be "freedom fighters" will not bring the United States any laurels and will only result in the senseless waste of money, in new sufferings for the peoples on whom the United States is trying to impose its will everywhere -- from Nicaragua to Afghanistan, from Angola to Libya -- and ultimately in indelible shame for the United States.

The times demand a new, wise approach to the resolution of both international and regional problems. Nobody's diktat is acceptable in the world community. Every people has the right to an independent choice of its path of political development. The dispute as to whose path is better cannot be resolved by force. Only the peoples themselves and history are capable of deciding that.

'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM ON U.S.-USSR RELATIONS

LD172331 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 17 Feb 86

[The "Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Posner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov from the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow]

[Text] [Posner] Today let's look at one of these issues that usually are discussed in times of strife and also in times of what would seem to be like better relations and that is -- it is almost like a reflex -- what's good for the Russians is bad for the Americans, what's good for the Americans is bad for the Russians. And certain people are now looking at the proposals that were formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev from that approach: If this is what the Russians want then it's not very good for the Americans.

[Bogdanov] I'm sorry Vladimir, did you put it in affirmative terms or as a question? Because I had this feeling that it might be taken both ways. What is your position about it?

[Posner] I don't want to give you my position. What I'm saying is that the position of the people in the States who say this is: What's good for the Russians is bad for the United States. Do we agree with that?

[Bogdanov] Ya. In other words it's a zero sum gain. That's very, very well known, you know, definition of that situation between USSR and United States, which is to my mind very wrong. By the way, we talk about now, about the new dimensions of the thinking in foreign policy matters and I believe that that's exactly what is new in our thinking; that is that there's no zero sum gain in the Soviet-American relations. I mean to say that in the nuclear era, or to be more precise in the nuclear cosmic era -- and I believe that should be used now, not nuclear but nuclear cosmic era -- there is no zero sum gain. There is nothing more dangerous than that in our relations.

[Posner] Now if we look at the recent message on the State of the Union that was delivered by President Reagan I think we have to say that there is still a very strong thread there of security through power, through force, through military might. And if you look at what the Pentagon has been asking for -- something like an 8 percent increase in the military budget -- again it's a repetition of this view. In other words, security through force. And going back to the initial statement about what's good for the Russians is bad for the United States, that would almost seem to be a reply to Mikhail Gorbachev's offer to do away with nuclear weapons by the year 2000 over a three stage period. How do you feel about all this, Dr. Plekhanov? What is your opinion?

[Plekhanov] Well I think that is a clear example of obsolete, dangerously obsolete, thinking and of some very, very misleading -- misled and misleading -- notions about the nature of Soviet-American relations. I think it is about time that both sides really thought seriously, and I know for sure that I've thought about it seriously and I would like it if both sides did that. About the question. Is it good for one side to see the other side weakened, damaged, undermined, (?subverted). Can it be useful? What gain can it bring?

Unfortunately there is a very deeply ingrained tendency in American political thinking to assume almost unthinkingly and automatically that, well, you know, the Soviet Union is so bad that whatever is done to undermine and damage it must be good for the United States. But nobody really questions the basis of this assumption and the basis is very faulty. The assumption is wrong and it is based on some very misguided ideas about what communism is all about, what peaceful coexistence is all about. There have been mountains and mountains of lies amassed over the period of the cold war and unfortunately the short period of detente in 1970 was not enough in order that we, you know, reduce some of that backlog, which (?I was) thinking of. You know in the last few years we've seen a revival of cold war thinking and I think it's not incidental that the policy is made by those people whose thinking was formed precisely in the period of the cold war and they find it very difficult to get out of that straight jacket, to have a fresh look at what's going on in the world. They prefer to cling to the old notions and they are captives of the obsolete doctrine.

[Posner] Looking...look at the proposals once again. As you recall we offer to do away with all nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and there are some people who say but in reality that's a very clever game because the Soviet Union has an enormous, enormous edge in conventional weapons so the whole idea of doing away with nuclear weapons is really a ploy through which the Soviet Union can then get a military advantage.

[Bogdanov] I would rather say that there is a ploy from the other side. I'm sorry for that, that word. You know why? You know why there is a ploy from the other side?

They take a part of Gorbachev's statement in which it is said that by the year 2000 no more nuclear arms and therefore they don't talk about the other, relating to that, proposals of very important nature. For instance they don't mention that in the same statement there is a very substantial part devoted to conventional forces. It is said in that statement that there is a real progress in Vienna talks, there is a real progress in Stockholm talks, dealing exactly with conventional problems. And we went very far suggesting that on-the-spot inspection, that some other inspection, be open for that in conventional field, number one. Number two: we are going as far as suggesting that we propose to pay very special attention to the so-called conventional arms, which are becoming not less dangerous than the nuclear arms. And we suggest banning all the dangerous conventional arms and we are open for discussions on the strength of conventional forces. But let me state for the record that people telling about the edge in conventional forces on the Soviet side they are not very fair people. I'm sorry to say they are not honest people.

You take the so-called central front. You know, central Europe -- the central front -- where the military forces -- NATO and Warsaw Pact -- are head to head. And if you are fair enough you will see that our central forces and NATO's central forces are almost equal. There is some differences with some categories but on the whole they're balanced.

And number three, the overall balance between Warsaw and NATO is almost the same. NATO has something like 5 million people and we have something like that, even less than NATO has. But you know to be more sophisticated, to be more, you know, smart in that, what they say now, they say OK the Soviet side may have really equal numbers of soldiers, equal numbers of this or that but, they say, they are very smart people, that in western, parts of the Soviet Union, in western military district, they have very big advantage over the NATO because they can mobilize their forces quicker than NATO do and things like that. I have no time to discuss this matter just point to that. You know they have just a chain of, you know, of things very falsified figures, very false, and I believe that, Vladimir, one of our meetings with our American listeners we should devote to that point by point discussion and try to explain to them that there is no truth in all that.

[Posner] But by all means.

[Bogdanov] By all means, you know. But that what you have mentioned, that's very important. So I feel that there is a very big fight, you know, there is a very big fight around this stake. Sometimes, I should admit, it's very honest, you know, honest worry, honest question. Honest, you know, willingness to discuss. But sometimes, Vladimir, I'm sorry to say, you come across the same lies to the same distortion of the truth and I object to this very much.

[Posner] After November, the Geneva meeting, there was a lot of talk about the spirit of Geneva, a very wonderful thing, and yet as I acquainted myself with President Reagan's State of the Union message, there were certain thoughts and certain ways of expressing them which to me begged the question: Just how much attention is being paid to the spirit of Geneva? Allow me to quote the President. He said: We have devoted 5 years trying to narrow a dangerous gap born of illusion and neglect and we have made important gains. Yet the threat from Soviet forces, conventional and strategic, from the Soviet drive for domination, from the increase in espionage and state terror, remains great.

Now in view of Geneva and the meetings he had there how does this sound to you? How are we to look forward to the development of the spirit of Geneva and this spirit perhaps getting a little bit of bone and meat on it and becoming body? How do you feel about that, Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well I am sorry that the President made that statement. It is no different from what he has been saying all along. I think that it's clear that rhetoric like this is used in order to obtain a certain amount of federal expenditures for a continuing military program, the military buildup, the SDI, the nuclear rearmament, what have you. Actually this is the only way that one can hope to continue the military buildup, by invoking the specter of the great big Soviet threat. This is the function or role of the Soviet threat in American politics, in American government. So it's no surprise that he is talking about that. But, you know, obtaining money for military expenditures and maintaining this psychosis about the Soviet Union is one thing and dealing with the real world and with the real dangers that exist in that world is another. In Geneva President Reagan came perhaps the closest to facing the real world and I guess that there are people around him who are afraid now that maybe the President has seen too much of the real world and they are doing whatever they can to...

[Bogdanov interrupts] I think that is very important point you are bringing up on that matter.

[Plekhanov] They are just trying to pull him back into the old ideological shell in which he spent so much of his time. And, you know, therefore I think it is very important that the dialogue that was started in Geneva continue and, er, because that's one way that one can expect a more advanced thinking, and more realistic approach.

[Posner] Right, a final question to you on this issue. Let us imagine that indeed the Soviet threat -- I put that in quotes -- were to disappear, that reality would become obvious, that it would be seen that there is no need for this kind of huge military expenditures in the United States. Would that indeed be bad for somebody? In other words I am asking perhaps, indeed, what's good for the Soviet Union is bad for some parts of America?

[Bogdanov] Well I understand what you are aiming at Vladimir, you mean the so-called military-industrial complex. By the way, that definition was not produced by us. I just remind that to my American listeners.

[Posner] No, President Eisenhower, yes.

[Bogdanov] President Eisenhower, so we have nothing to do with that definition but somehow we accept it because we feel there is some truth in it. I do not belong to people who, you know, professes the theory of conspiracy, some military-industrial complex conspiracy, something like that, but of course when you spend on the so-called defense billions and billions, when the Reagan administration spends within several years over 1 trillion bucks on military defense...

[Plekhanov interrupts] ...1.2 trillion.

[Bogdanov] ...1.2 trillion, yes, yes Sergey, so of course you have a number of people interested in getting this money.

[Posner] Bread and butter issues, yes?

[Bogdanov] A bread and butter issue for them.

[Posner] Even caviar too.

[Bogdanov] Even caviar, oh yes Vladimir, and a lot of caviar by the way, a lot of caviar. So of course they would be interested in that and they are not to my mind, they are not nationally-minded people because they are very...they are caring about the immediate interest and they don't make a conclusion what does it bring back to America in the sense of reducing American security. And to my mind, you know, that's the responsibility of the American ruling elite or whatever it be, you know, to control all that, because sometimes at this end we have an impression that military-industrial, and I would add to that academic complex, which is to my mind is not less dangerous than military-industrial because they supply academics, they supply all, you know, ideas how to use military weapons, nuclear weapons, you know, because it is not less dangerous than to produce them. So that is their business, you know, to control this. But as I told you at this end we have, sometimes we have, an impression that it's going out of control, becoming uncontrolled and I understand why. More billions, more trillions to spend, more, you know, unstable you make the whole business.

[Posner] All right, er, yes. Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] I would just add a few things on this point. I met a young journalist from Massachusetts the other day and he was all enthusiastic about what military spending is doing to the economy of New England. He said, well, you know, if you saw it you would be very impressed, all those high technology orders coming from the federal government, and so on and so forth. I understand the people who are helpless before the argument of those who are saying that, well, you know, guns are good for the American economy, they keep the jobs, they allow the corporations to get richer and so on, that's capitalism. But I think one should ask a question: Is a military program the only kind of high technology spending that is open to high technology corporations in the United States? Why can't we, and I mean the Soviet Union and the United States, think up joint projects of space exploration which would demand even more advanced kinds of technology and would provide millions of people with new jobs and corporations with new orders. Why can't all those high technology firms think about, if it doesn't matter to them on what to spend their money, if it's just profits, why can't it be used productively?

[Posner] Well I think that you've thrown out a few thoughts for our listeners today, serious thoughts that should keep them busy for at least a week, so I want to thank both of you for participating in today's program. This is Vladimir Posner saying goodbye to the panel and to "Top Priority" until a week from today at the same time.

HABIB 'GROSSLY INTERFERING' IN PHILIPPINES

LD181425 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 18 TASS -- The mission of Philip Habib, a special representative of the U.S. President, is under the threat of failure. Philip Habib came to the Philippines to "reconciliate" the conflicting political groupings, but actually he is grossly interfering into internal affairs of that sovereign country.

According to the press, the leader of the opposition Corazon Aquino has told the emissary of the White House that she will agree to nothing but Ferdinand Marcos' stepping down from the presidency. Speaking to journalists, she criticized Washington's attempts to exert pressure upon her.

Ferdinand Marcos also turns down pressure from the envoy of the White House. Whatever conclusions are made by Philip Habib, Marcos makes it clear that he does not intend to recognise the election returns as null and void, stresses a correspondent of the U.S. NBC television company. Ferdinand Marcos is confident that he will be able to stabilise the situation in the country irrespective of American support.

The opposition stubbornly rejects the official election returns, accusing the ruling regime of rigging the elections and demanding that Corazon Aquino be recognised as winner of the elections. The United States, having encountered the threat of a further heightening of tension, is making feverish efforts to put the situation in the Philippines under its control. Along with the use of political and financial-economic levels they in Washington do not rule out the use of military force.

A new mass demonstration of protest against U.S. interference into internal affairs of the Philippines was held today outside the American Embassy in Manila. Several thousand demonstrators chanted the slogan "Yankees, go home". Anti-American sentiments are mounting in both camps -- those of Marcos and Aquino, notes a REUTER correspondent.

Assassination Plan Noted

LD181744 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] An anti-Philippine campaign is growing in the United States. The PHILIPPINE NEWS AGENCY reports some American congressmen are nurturing plans for the CIA to assassinate Ferdinand Marcos. Senator Jeremiah Denton has Congress believing the present Philippine president is unable to insure American interests in his country in full. The largest U.S. overseas bases are located in the Philippines.

U.S. 'APPLAUDS' FRENCH MILITARY ACTION IN CHAD

LD181831 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 18 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyfull-Mullyukov]

[Text] The U.S. Administration applauds the bold action by France in Chad -- that is how a State Department spokesman expressed the White House's official attitude to the French intervention in this African country. Meanwhile, French Jaguar strike aircraft and Mirage fighters continue to arrive at Ndjamena airport, and soldiers of fortune are hurrying to the aid of the French expeditionary corps from neighboring African states. Washington has announced a speed-up of military supplies to Chad.

Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan Jamahariyah stated that the United States and France are cooperating in creating a U.S. military base in Chad; this would make it possible for the United States to influence the course of events in central Africa, he stressed. Libya, he said, does not intend to interfere in Chad's internal affairs, even though Paris has broken its pledges concerning this country.

ANATOLIY GROMYKO CRITICIZES 6TH FLEET MANEUVERS

PM181315 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[Interview with A.A. Gromyko, director of the Africa Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric "Interview by the Teletypewriter": "Dangerous Brinkmanship"]

[Text] The following TASS report was received in the editorial office:

"The Organization of Mediterranean Socialist and Progressive Parties has issued a resolute condemnation of the U.S. 6th Fleet's maneuvers directly off the Libyan coast."

We asked Anatoliy Andreyevich Gromyko, director of the Africa Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to comment on this report.

Such alarming reports, coming not only from the North African region, have merged today, figuratively speaking, into a united international chorus that is making it very difficult for Washington to escalate its anti-Libyan campaign. The Mediterranean peoples, despite the NATO countries' American propaganda efforts, condemn the irresponsible actions of the American Administration and its partner, Israel -- actions fraught with the possible emergence of an armed conflict. But some people in Washington today are impatient to use the doctrine of "neoglobalism" in practice and to intimidate Arab and African peoples with its sinister imperial spirit. The "new globalism" is the old song of violence and blackmail in a new wrapping.

It is precisely against Libya that the United States has tried to strike, using methods of military blackmail and economic blockade and not abandoning, in principle, armed intervention against the sovereign state.

But the "hawks" of Washington and Tel Aviv have been unable to "bleed" the country that is in the vanguard of the struggle for Arab independence. All American sanctions against the Libyan Jamahiriya have encountered resistance even from allies. One can only be amazed at the thickheadedness of American politicians who are continuing to fuel tension off Libya's coasts. The second maneuvers in the first 6 weeks of the new year are already in full swing.

Balancing on the brink of a military conflict, the American Administration is seeking to provoke the Libyan leadership into actions that might serve as grounds for direct aggression. According to President Reagan's words at a recent press conference, "he has given his approval" for U.S. warships and aircraft to intrude into Libya's waters and airspace. And Washington's representative to the UN Security Council vetoed a draft resolution condemning the Israeli act of air piracy against a Libyan civilian aircraft.

Despite world public protests, the United States and Israel are continuing to implement their militarist plan to establish hegemony in the region, which hinges on the destabilization and overthrow of M. al-Qadhdhafi's government, which is pursuing an independent anti-imperialist policy. Under such conditions Libya reserves the right to defend its security and sovereignty in every possible way.

REAGAN PLANNING CREATION OF CARIBBEAN BLOC

LD181601 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Georgetown, 18 Feb (TASS) -- The Washington administration is pushing through the turning of the so-called "Caribbean forces for the maintenance of peace" into a nucleus of a reactionary military and political bloc being knocked together by the United States in the region. This is precisely the aim, in the opinion of observers in the Caribbean countries, of the 1-day visit to Grenada by U.S. President Reagan, which will take place on Thursday of this week. He is also planning to meet there with leaders of certain Caribbean countries. It is presumed that one of the main matters at the meeting will be the creation of the reactionary bloc that will take on the function of the United State's gendarme in the region.

It is far from an accident that Grenada has been chosen as Washington's place for the meeting. It was this Caribbean island state that became one of the victims of the U.S. policy towards active fanning of regional conflicts and intensifying U.S. interference in the affairs of other states, which was officialized in the form of the so-called "doctrine of neoglobalism." In accordance with this imperialist doctrine the United States is waging undeclared wars against Nicaragua, Angola, Afghanistan,and other states.

The international airport at Point Salinas, the building of which began on Grenada at the time of the Maurice Bishop government, has been virtually turned into an air base by the Pentagon. The plan by the White House to "dedicate" this airport, on the site of which the blood of hundreds of completely innocent people was shed during the U.S. intervention, to the U.S. President seems like blatant cynicism and a mockery of the national feelings of Grenadians.

On the matter of establishing monitoring of the Carribean basin Washington is collaborating closely with its junior NATO partner, Great Britain. According to press reports Britain has begun the creation of their "rapid deployment force" there, the main target of which will be the Caribbean countries. According to figures in the Grenadian INDIES TIMES about 10,000 men will make up this corps. The first maneuvers by the British "rapid deployment force," which will act in close interaction with the similar U.S. interventionist corps, are planned to be held as soon as this year.

Commenting on London's decision the paper points out that it has arisen out of a desire to secure the military presence of Britain even in such a distant region of the earth from Great Britain as the Caribbean basin.

DRAMA AT U.S. EMBASSY CONCERT RECOUNTED

LD181343 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1113 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Commentary by TASS observer Viktor Ponomarev]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Feb (TASS) -- A reception was going on at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. The highlight of the program was a dazzling "Steinway" grand piano, the property of the host, worth $60,000, and the pianist Feltsman, invited to play on it.

Well, the grand piano became the pretext for a major scandal. When the pianist was running his fingers along the keyboard, the splendid instrument suddenly started playing out of tune. The maestro went into hysterics. The foreign journalists, just as though they had been waiting for this moment, dashed to see this "sensation". Cameras clicked, under the lights of the TV cameras Feltsman examined the inside of the "Steinway" and, pulling a tragical face, uttered: -- Some has sawn the strings...And added: -- I know who.

Several foreign correspondents at once sent out sensational reports. There was everything there, "sabotage by local personnel" as well as "the persecution of a young pianist by the authorities" and even "pressure on the embassy of a foreign state". To the accompaniment of the U.S. propagandist and diplomatic "orchestra" the false string became the solo theme of a malevolent anti-Soviet spectacle.

The concert did take place, of course. But the stir around it was meant to demonstrate to the whole world the incredibly difficult conditions in which U.S. Embassy have to carry out their mission. The subject is not a new one! The world has often been told that U.S. diplomats in Moscow are irradiated with invisible rays, sprinkled with some substance as if they were roaches, given poisoned water to drink, and recklessly set alight. And even though all these idle tales burst like bubbles, the "concerts" apparently are continuing.

It is only a pity that it was the maestro Feltsman who agreed to perfrom the "solo on the pianoforte" to the overseas audience. The scandalous popularity and dubious publicity for which he is striving so much with the aid of U.S. diplomats and foreign journalists will not enhance his reputation.

Life is full of surprises. They can happen even at the U.S. Embassy and, for sure, the supreme wisdom of diplomatic representatives consists in not composing any new variations for the next "tawdry drama".

VARIOUS TV LINKUP PROGRAMS SCHEDULED FOR 1986

PM181044 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 6

[Vl. Arsenyev interview with Leonid Zolotarevskiy under the rubric "We Report Details" and the headline "Dialogue Above the Continents"]

[Excerpts] On Wednesday, 19 February on the first program you will be able to see and hear a television linkup between Leningraders and the inhabitants of the U.S. city of Seattle, Washington. At Central Television's Main Administration for Foreign Relations we were told about this dialogue through space by Leonid Zolotarevskiy.

[Zolotarevskiy] The dialogue was to a great extent unusual. This was the first television linkup between America and not Moscow but Leningrad. A television group from the United States went there. Its specialists invited people to participate in the broadcast, which was in the format of a question and answer session. Some 200 people assembled in a Leningrad Television Center studio -- workers, war veterans, students, kolkhoz members, artists, two priests came...

The moderator on our side was Vladimir Posner and on the U.S. side Phil Donahue -- a popular television commentator in his own country whose picture is published in many magazines. His manner -- as you will see -- is energetic. The Americans asked various questions -- about Soviet citizens' participation in running the state and, for example, about whether we are scared of terrorists.

[Arsenyev] About the future... What other meetings with the help of space satellites might viewers be seeing in the near future?

[Zolotarevskiy] There have been many proposals from U.S. television studios. I will mention those broadcasts that will take place. On the subjects "Business Life and International Trade" (intended for May), "Cultural Cooperation" (August-September), and "The Role of Sociopolitical Organizations in the United States and the USSR" (November-December). One other piece of news. The social organization "Physicians for Social Responsibility" came up with the initiative of holding six Leningrad-Philadelphia television linkups. There may possibly be other television linkups -- Mosfilm-Hollywood, Vancouver (Canada)-Lvov, our "Travelers' Club" and the U.S. National Geographical Society, and a dialogue between Soviet and U.S. parliamentarians...

CHALLENGER CREW VICTIMS OF IRRATIONAL HASTE

LD181853 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 18 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] The search for wreckage from the Challenger continues. We speak of the seven daring American astronauts who perished in the very first seconds of this tragic odyessy as one speaks of a legend. Now one can probably add that they fell victim not to circumstance, but to irrational haste. The heads of NASA knew about the possibility of a disaster on the Challenger craft, but nevertheless, they decided to stage the launch. This monstrous fact has been reported by CBS television.

NASA's concern in connection with the problems that arose with the synthetic seals where the solid-fuel boosters joined was concealed from the astronauts, THE HOUSTON POST has reported. It has also come to light that 1 day before the Challenger launch, specialists of the company producing solid-fuel boosters for the spacecraft unanimously demanded that the launch be delayed; they were concerned that the sleeving meant to join the parts of the rocket would not function normally in the cold weather. In the opinion of many U.S. specialists, CBS notes, the fracture of one such piece of sleeving was the cause of the disaster.

Figuratively speaking, the explosive wave brought about by this disaster continues to spread. There are reports of mass dismissals at enterprises of the U.S. companies producing solid-fuel boosters. It is not impossible, writes the Paris L'ECHO, that a real purge will begin in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as well.

U.S. BATTLESHIP IOWA SAILS FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

LD182142 Moscow TASS in English 2128 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 18 TASS -- The U.S. battleship Iowa escorted by the missile frigate John Hall left their bases on the eastern coast of the United States Tuesday morning and sailed out to sea for operations off the Pacific shores of Central America. A Pentagon spokesman refused to give any specifics on the operations, only saying that they should underscore U.S. perpetual interest in that region and back the policy pursued there by the United States. The U.S. press points out that the permanent presence of U.S. warships off Central America is, above all, in pursuit of putting pressure on the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua.

U.S. PRESS AGENCIES CENSOR GORBACHEV INTERVIEW

PM171459 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Report by TASS correspondent M. Knyazkov for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Using Scissors Against The Truth"; first graf is reader's letter]

[Excerpts] "The interview Comrade Gorbachev gave to the French paper L'HUMANITE aroused tremendous interest worldwide. How was it greeted in the United States?

O. Mereschencnko, Moscow Oblast."

"Frankly, I regard as hypocritical the strident campaign that aims at 'proving' that the USSR (and, by implication, socialism in general) is a society in which uniformity, official like-mindedness, and so on and so forth hold sway," CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev said in reply to L'HUMANITE's questions.

I deliberately chose this quotation. There is much to confirm it. Including the coverage of M.S. Gorbachev's interview in "the freest country in the free world." What a commotion there was among the owners of local papers on the night of 7 February when reports began to come in from the other side of the Atlantic, where the morning of a new day was already breaking, that the French paper L'HUMANITE had published a long interview with the CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

And how! What have Americans always been told about the USSR? A country where there are more jails than kindergartens, where critics of shortcomings invariably end up in Siberia, and where within the walls of the Kremlin sinister plans are being hatched to establish worldwide Soviet control.

Then an authoritative statement by the Soviet leader appears, in which he talks sincerely and objectively, without mincing words, about our gains and omissions, problems and plans for the future. He talked of the USSR's desire not only to curb the arms race, but to eliminate nuclear weapons on earth altogether. In short, the very sincerity of the pronouncements demolishes the pyramid of lies which the United States is erecting so assiduously around our country.

But the local propaganda experts' arsenal of jesuitic methods is truly inexhaustible. AP's Paris correspondent was the first to gather his wits. He brandished his scissors and -- snip, snip! -- exactly three paragraphs of answers remain. Not about the USSR's peace proposals and not about socialist democracy, of course. He told Americans, making his own cuts and insertions, only what was said about Western propaganda's "favorite child" -- Sakharov. UPI pulled more or less the same stunt.

By and large, the interview was presented to Americans in an eviscerated and simply unrecognizable form. Basically, it had felt the "ax" of the very censorship which M.S. Gorbachev had talked about and whose purpose is, in particular, to deprive ordinary Americans of access to the truth about the Soviet Union.

TALKS TO RESUME WITH JAPAN ON CULTURAL PACT

OW181259 Tokyo KYODO in English 1254 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Excerpts] Tokyo, Feb. 18 KYODO -- Japan and the Soviet Union will resume talks on a cultural agreement Thursday in Tokyo, a Foreign Ministry source said Tuesday. A team of Soviet Foreign Ministry officials is due to arrive here Wednesday for talks of an unknown duration.

Working-level negotiations to conclude the cultural agreement were suspended in Moscow in early January, just before a visit to Japan by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. During the January visit, Shevardnadze and his Japanese counterpart Shintaro Abe agreed to step up efforts to come to an agreement that can be signed when Abe visits Moscow, probably later this year.

TRANSCRIPT OF SHEVARDNAZE'S TOKYO NEWS CONFERENCE

PM141127 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 5, 10 Feb 86 pp 11-13

["Transcript of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's Press Conference at the Japanese Press Club in Tokyo, January 19": "Both Sides The Gainers"]

[Text] Shevardnadze. Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to thank the leadership of the Japanese Press Club and personally Mr Arai for their kind invitation to meet you.

I must frankly say that, this being Sunday, I expected a smaller attendance at this, my first press conference on the talks that have been held. But it has worked the other way around. I was reluctant to spoil your rest day, but I believe that newsmen do not relax, not only on Sundays, but also when they sleep. After all, when journalists and diplomats take a day off, public opinion is left to its own devices. And that is hardly desirable.

I have been told that Japanese newsmen have "complained" that the Soviet side has been "regulating" the information on the talks we have had here. I think the reproach is not quite justified. First, there were press releases and public pronouncements. Sufficient material was made available for obtaining an idea of the nature of the talks and the atmosphere in which they were held. Second, as a rule, talks proceed in such a way as to make it difficult to say precisely where the discussion of one or another issue is completed, especially if it is a question of the world situation and problems relating to security. Besides, we made a point of not hurrying with conclusions before hearing out the other side and putting forward our own arguments.

Now, after three rounds of talks and unofficial conversations with Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe and an interesting and meaningful meeting with Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, some conclusions can be drawn.

Above all the resumption of political dialogue, which both sides firmly agreed to continue, is a positive fact in itself. It may be said that we now have a much better idea of each other's positions, moreover, on a wide range of issues. In this respect we took a step forward. The important thing is that the desire to meet each other half-way was mutual and sincere.

As you know, a message from CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev was conveyed to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone inviting him to visit the Soviet Union. Mikhail Gorbachev was similarly invited to visit your splendid country. This means that political contacts will be continued at the highest level.

The positions of the sides were brought closer together on a number of international problems, primarily regional issues and also some bilateral questions.

A joint communique the content of which I would say is good, substantive and business-like, was agreed upon.

We regard the documents signed as being of a positive character -- the agreement on trade and payments in 1986-90 and the convention providing for exemption from dual taxation. We also prolonged the term of the exchange of letters on cultural ties and agreed to speed up talks on the conclusion of an agreement on cultural ties so as to be able to sign it when Mr Abe comes to Moscow.

An important positive aspect of our work was the reaching of agreement in principle to activate cooperation in the sphere of science and technology.

Mention must also be made to the fact that the talks proceeded in a correct, respectful manner, although they at times dealt with rather acute issues. I must also tell you in confidence that there were some heated arguments.

We proceeded from the principles of equality, equal rights, and equal concern on both sides for the strengthening of cooperation. We also spoke about improvement of our relations not being allowed to be detrimental to third countries. We went on record that the Soviet Union and Japan are not rivals when it is a matter of economic and commercial intercourse, for by virtue of their economic potentials our countries are in a sense mutually complementary.

The talks are now over and, naturally, commentaries on them have begun to appear. On the whole, the picture they give is quite objective. Nevertheless, they reveal a certain desire to establish which side was the gainer. Conjectures are built around the so called "territorial question." In my youth I dabbled a little in journalism and intuitively foresee that you are going to ask me about that question.

True enough, it was raised by the Japanese side. And we duly replied. Our stand is well known. Not long ago it was expounded, among other things, to Japanese representatives by our party and government leaders. We stressed that if we really want to improve our relations, it is essential not to lose sight of the existing realities.

As for who was the gainer, I believe that both sides gained by the talks. The only losers are those who sought to complicate them. We accomplished big, useful job of work. We now see the future of our relations in a more optimistic light, despite the complex problems that still exist. It seems to me that differences and disagreements will remain. But this should not be dramatized. We must work to improve relations between our countries step by step.

Relations between states are like relations inside a large family. They have to live together, at times in concord and sometimes in discord lasting years, if not centuries. And experience shows that discord does little good, it only spoils things. It is also a good thing that we have seriously begun to seek accord. On behalf of the Soviet side I can say that on the whole we are satisfied with the results of our talks in Tokyo.

I am also glad that the range of our contacts here was wide. My meeting with Masashi Ishibashi, Chairman of the Socialist Party, was most rewarding. I also had a comradely, serious conversation with the Chairman of the Japanese Communist Party, Kenji Miyamoto, and other leaders of that party. And today I have two more meetings scheduled with the mayors of Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

We have met official spokesmen, businessmen, workers, and teachers. But my wife had the most interesting meeting of all, with Japanese children. I had a memorable meeting with Governor Suzuki of Tokyo. We would like to thank him for his hospitality.

Our visits of the Nissan plant and the Sony scientific and technological exhibition were extremely interesting. I promised that on my foreign trips I would "boost" the output of these firms. We were greatly impressed by a performance we saw at the Kabuki theatre. It was pleasant to witness how the Japanese cherish the cultural legacy of the past, and how skillfully they organize modern production.

To return to the talks, I should like to stress that in my opinion it is important to sense whether we managed to get a rapport, whether both sides are prepared to build the edifice of their relations on the foundation laid now. I would answer this in the affirmative. Incidentally, it seems to me that the press intuitively gave a correct appraisal of the spirit and trend of our talks. This is a confirmation of your professional skill, your knowledge of the existing realities. I have acquainted myself with your appraisals during our visit and wish to say that on the whole your coverage has been objective and interesting. I know one must not spoil one's relations with the press.

I should like to dwell in greater detail on a question which occupied a central place in the meeting with Prime Minister Nakasone and the talks with Foreign Minister Abe. I am referring to the initiatives put forward by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, initiatives comprehensive in scale and truly historic in significance which open a real avenue to the elimination of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the end of the century. I found it noteworthy that the leaders of Japanese political parties I talked with yesterday described these initiatives as epochal.

I believe that you are well acquainted with the statement made by Gorbachev, and hence shall not go into it in detail. I only wish to stress that our proposals cover the entire range of issues relating to the limitation and elimination of armaments, primarily the nuclear and chemical. The Soviet Union's comprehensive programme directed at removing the threat of nuclear destruction by the end of the century has evoked great interest the world over and met with wide support on the part of both governments and the public.

It must be noted, however, that attempts are already being made to erode the substance of our proposals, to implant scepticism in people's minds, doubts as to the feasibility of the objective set. There are some who, while complimenting the Soviet initiative, are trying to sidetrack its discussion far off course. To begin with it is approached not as the integral, all-embracing programme it is. It may be said that the idea is to fragment it into isolated elements.

The day before yesterday we visited an auto plant and saw the conveyor in operation. In relation to our initiative it might be said that certain quarters would like to reverse the conveyor in order to dismantle the up-to-date working model of disarmament already assembled. A different "technology" is also used. An argument is started as to who was the first and it is hinted that the Soviet proposals have been borrowed from the American side. If this were so, it would seem that there should be no hitches in working out a programme for the abolition of nuclear and chemical weapons and carrying out other arms limitation measures.

Again we hear allegations that the Soviet Union is once more laying down preliminary conditions. It is insisting, you see, on the U.S. dropping the "star wars" programme. For those bent on embarking on an arms race in the most dangerous area of all - in outer space - our stand is truly an impediment.

But it is absurd to talk about doing away with nuclear weapons while developing new space strike weapons, which in no sense are less dangerous than the nuclear and are envisaged as an addition to the already existing mass destruction weapons potentials. Once we decide to disarm, armaments must be eliminated and not carried over from Earth to outer space.

A few words about verification. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement makes it clear that we are for combining all forms of verification -- through national technical means, international mechanisms, on-the-spot inspections, and access to relevant research laboratories.

We propose working out clear-cut procedures that would fully guarantee the destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons and preclude the possibility of their reappearance. The impression is that whatever forms of verification we agree to, the other side promptly thinks up new ones in order to evade any real disarmament measures.

The proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev offer a real alternative to the increasingly dangerous arms race which must be checked, and open the prospect of a more secure world for all. To this end the Soviet Union is ready for wide cooperation with all who proceed from positions of reason, good will, and awareness of their responsibility for ensuring humanity a future without wars and without armaments.

In this connection I should like to recall what the well-known Latin American writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez said about decisions taken with a sense of responsibility today -- being operative also in the 21st century. It seems to me that the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev has precisely this significance: it anticipates how and in what situation we shall enter the next century.

Assembled in this hall are representatives of the press of different countries. I would like each of you to construct a mental picture of what an uncontrolled arms race and the further sophistication of the means of destruction would spell for your countries. Think of the situation in which we all would find ourselves in the year 2000, if we are destined to see it at all. Compare your forecast with the situation that could come into being if the programme for a radical break with military rivalry advanced by Gorbachev is realized. In the final analysis we shall have to answer to coming generations.

Thank you. I am now ready to answer your questions.

YOMIURI. My question relates to the territorial problem. The joint communique has not yet been made public and we do not know its contents, nor do we know how the territorial question which interests us most, is reflected in it. From the standpoint of the Japanese people, this question is the most important, but the Soviet side maintains that either it has been resolved or does not figure at all in our relations. I should therefore like to take advantage of your visit to Japan to ask you once again what historical and legal justification is there for the four northern islands being Soviet territory?

Shevardnadze. You said that the joint communique has not yet been made public. You have not long to wait, for it will be published tonight. Judging by the Japanese press, Foreign Minister Abe has told newsmen that the Japanese side raised the territorial question at the talks and that the Soviet side stated its position. This is a problem on which we did not reach understanding. As regards the legal and historical grounds on which the Soviet position is based, here nothing has changed.

There are also other problems in our relations which are rather complicated and difficult. But despite the differences, we agreed with the leadership of your country to search for ways of deepening mutual understanding and moving step by step towards normalization of relations.

Soviet television. How do things stand as regards the projected meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and the U.S. President, and can it be understood that by his statement Comrade Gorbachev is making the problems of nuclear and chemical weapons the central issue at this meeting?

Shevardnadze. In Geneva agreement in principle was reached on continuing the Soviet-American summit meetings. The idea is that Mikhail Gorbachev will visit the U.S. and meet the President and the U.S. President will visit the Soviet Union next year. The dates have not yet been fixed. Arrangements are now being made and the dates will be announced later. We are seriously preparing for this meeting. Our most important argument is the statement by Comrade Gorbachev. Needless to say, security and disarmament will hold the central place in the Soviet leader's meeting with the U.S. President. This is how we visualize the meeting. If you consider my answer insufficiently exhaustive, we can talk about it again in Moscow.

ASAHI. Concerning the political dialogue between Japan and the Soviet Union. Japan was once visited by Mr Mikoyan. That visit evoked much interest and there was actually talk in Japan about a "Mikoyan boom." I believe that if the CPSU General Secretary paid a visit to our country, there could be a "Gorbachev boom." In my opinion top-level exchanges of visits is an effective way of improving Japanese-Soviet relations. My first question: is there a possibility that the CPSU General Secretary might visit Japan this year, before Prime Minister Nakasone visits the Soviet Union? A second question: if the summit does take place, can we Japanese expect, as a result of such a meeting, more pleasant news in regard to the territorial question than we heard from you today?

Shevardnadze. A long question, but the answer will be brief. Strictly speaking I already answered it in my statement. Mr Nakasone has been invited to visit the Soviet Union. He in his turn has invited General Secretary Gorbachev to visit Japan. Let us not anticipate events. I believe that the top leaders will decide for themselves where they will meet. I do not know exactly what Gorbachev's time schedule is, but one thing I know for sure: he is very eager to see Japan and meet the Japanese people. As regards the angle from which the "territorial problem" will be examined by the top leaders of the two countries, I would not care to go into that now. That would be in a way interference in their internal affairs. At the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Masashi Ishibashi, the Chairman of the Japanese Socialist Party, the "territorial question" was raised by the Japanese side. I assume that you know of the answer given by the Soviet side.

MAINICHI. What does the Soviet Union expect of economic cooperation with Japan? In other words, what part does economic cooperation with Japan play in the development of Soviet economy?

Shevardnadze. Most likely the Soviet Union expects exactly what Japan does from the development of bilateral economic cooperation. I have already said in my statement that we are equally interested in developing economic cooperation. And if the question is put in such a way as to suggest, say, that the Soviet Union is more interested in cooperation than Japan or vice versa, we shall not be able to achieve a serious expansion of that cooperation. We are not competitors, our economic and trade structures are mutually complementary. In this sense it is clear that both sides must be interested in developing their trade and economic ties, and this is what makes such ties useful.

So as not to return to this question let me say this. Japan can exist without the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union, too, will not perish if we do not have economic cooperation with Japan. But it is better to live together, to help each other solve the complex problems of a socio-economic and scientific and technical nature.

ASSOCIATED PRESS. My question is connected with the Soviet Union's attitude to SDI. President Reagan has often said that at present this is a matter only of research into the defensive possibilities and the object is not to create an offensive weapon. The United States is therefore, continuing research relating to defence in outer space. It is not against the U.S.S.R. conducting similar research. Why, then, should the Soviet side object to similar research in the United States?

Shevardnadze. No one prevents you from engaging in research. Mikhail Gorbachev has made this quite plain. Laboratory research is going on both in the U.S.A. and in the U.S.S.R. If you create space strike weapons we shall do the same, we shall not be found wanting. But we are proposing an altogether different concept to do away with all that hinders us now from delivering people of the fear of nuclear catastrophe, to destroy nuclear weapons, to destroy chemical weapons. What need would there be in that case for a so-called "defence system"? Against what? Against whom? What is the need of it? Why spend trillions and trillions of dollars on creating that system? The alternative we propose is this: let us cooperate in the peaceful exploration of outer space, in the peaceful exploration of Mars, and so on, for there are plenty of planets and galaxies. This is a tremendous field for exploration. And so it is quite a different programme the Soviet Union is proposing. The logic is not on your side.

I cannot reply to this question calmly because the life of humanity on Earth is at stake. SDI is not as innocuous a programme as it is depicted. It is a military programme, a programme for the militarization of outer space. Let me remind you of the philosophy propounded by U.S. President Johnson: he who dominates outer space will dominate the Earth as well. That is the secret of the "star wars" concept.

It is even sometimes said in the U.S. that the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in scientific research, in particular in the creation of space weapons. If that is so, the American side should be even more interested in prohibiting space weaponry. A far better course would be to keep the sky and outer space clear for peaceful cooperation.

The chairman then declared the press conference closed and thanked the Soviet Foreign Minister.

U.S.-JAPANESE FIGHTER EXERCISES UNDER WAY

LD170743 Moscow TASS in English 0720 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Tokyo, February 17 TASS -- The Air Forces of Japan and the United States started exercises in the air space of the Japanese island of Shikoku today. Japanese fighter aircraft based at Nyutabaru Airbase and U.S. Air Force fighter planes from Okinawa are being involved in the exercises.

During the exercises to last till February 21, the pilots will carry out training in air combat and in hitting surface targets. The local section of the Socialist Party and trade unions staged a mass rally at the gates of Nyutabaru base in protest against the war games.

Military Ties Viewed

PM180943 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by S. Agafonov: "Forced March"]

[Text] Tokyo -- Since the beginning of the new year, the subject of American-Japanese military ties seems to have gotten a second wind.

The first specific agreement on the transfer of Japanese military technology to the United States, a meeting of representatives of the Pentagon and the Japanese National Defense Agency in Hawaii, a trip across the ocean by a Japanese group to study SDI, and an entire range of various caliber staff and troop joint exercises around the Japanese islands....

Statements concerning the prospects of military policy made recently in Washington and Tokyo are a distinctive addition to all this.

In his report to Congress, the U.S. defense secretary outlined Japan's role in the strategic scenario composed by the Pentagon. Answering a parliamentary inquiry, his Japanese colleague partly raised the veil over certain practical aspects of this scenario.

According to Kato's statement, Japan will back up by military means American naval operations beyond the bounds of Japanese territorial waters in "the event of exceptional circumstances." The chief of the National Defense Agency termed these measures "legal and not at variance with the right to self-defense as envisaged by the country's Constitition." Evaluation of this statement by the Japanese press has been unequivocal: The government is broadening the concept of the sphere of activity of "Self-Defense Forces." As ASAHI writes, this interpretation virtually means that Japanese Armed Forces can be sent to any region of the world.

The original interchange between Weinberger and Kato can hardly be called accidental. Washington and Tokyo are moving toward "a new era of allied relations" at a forced march. This question is becoming increasingly acute in Japan. Several days ago ASAHI published a letter from (Khirosi Takeda), 68 years old, and an employee in the Oita Prefecture. "The Japanese people," (Takeda) wrote,"know that war can bring nothing other than death and destruction. A renunciation of war is recorded in the Article Nine of our Constitution. Nevertheless, the Japanese Self-Defense Forces, which were formed by circumventing the Constitution, continue to build up their power and conduct constant maneuvers with U.S. troops, demonstrating their potential. Prime Minister Nakasone, where you are leading Japan? We await a clear answer."

IZVESTIYA EXAMINES JAPANESE POLITICAL SCENE

PM181148 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov maiden dispatch: "Japan-86 The Situation in February ...." -- first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Excerpts] Sergey Agafonov, IZVESTIYA's own correspondent in Japan, has started work there. He is a graduate of the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University's Faculty of Journalism. He has worked for IZVESTIYA since 1981, and is a member of the USSR Union of Journalists. We publish his reportage.

Y. Nakasone's second term in office as president of the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] and prime minister of Japan runs out this year. The party rules limit tenure in these positions to two 2-year periods. Consequently, Y. Nakasone will have to either resign or campaign for a revision of the rules. Meanwhile, claims to leadership positions are being made by the LDP's so-called "new leaders" -- Foreign Minister S. Abe, Finance Minister N. Takeshita, and K. Miyazawa, chairman of the LDP Executive Council.

They declared at the beginning of the year that they would not stand against Nakasone before the May meeting of leaders from the "big seven" (the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Canada, and Japan) in Tokyo. As soon as this event is over each of them will consider himself free of all obligations and will seriously engage in "personal matters." Essentially this means that an open struggle for power will be launched within the LDP in the very near future.

All this will be affected by the elections for the upper chamber of parliament, scheduled for June. This prospect is also borne in mind by the opposition. The press is unanimous that 1986 could have a noticeable effect on the political situation in the country.

The importance of the foreign policy factor must be mentioned in particular. Recently official Tokyo has been speaking often about the need to boost Japan's international role, but the consolidation and improvement of American-Japanese relations remain the starting point in the formulation of foreign policy. There can be no argument that the United States is Japan's main partner. The point is, however, that there is no equality in this partnership. We are, of course, talking not about the trade imbalance, which is in Tokyo's favor, but about the political one, which is in Washington's. From this viewpoint, the thesis of "boosting the international role" while looking over the shoulder at the United States will not bring any glory to its originators but will rather have a boomerang effect on the government's course.

Let me cite a typical example. The local municipal council in the small town of (Dzusi), where the LDP is in the majority, is fighting against the mayor who was nominated by the town's public organizations. The problem is that barracks for U.S. servicemen are planned to be built in (Dzusi). The mayor is against this and the town council is in favor. The LDP representatives have gathered the two-thirds majority of the municipal council that is needed to dismiss the mayor. The voters in (Dzusi) responded to this by demanding that the town assembly be disbanded. The outcome of the clash will become clear in a month's time, but it is already evident that the LDP's stance does not correspond with the voters' interests.

This instance may seem to be somewhat parochial. Coupled with others, however, it indicates that the gap between the interests of the majority of Japanese people and the course of the cabinet is not closing. This does not mean that any collisions are to be expected in the near future, but there does exist a tendency for the situation to develop further and there is no reason to perceive this tendency as favoring the LDP.

It cannot be said that the authorities are unaware of this. On the contrary, the main emphasis in speeches by leaders of the ruling camp is placed precisely on Japan's "independence" in international affairs. There is no doubt that Tokyo does have opportunities to advance in this direction, and considerable opportunities at that. Broad scope for constructive actions in the world arena is also offered to the Land of the Rising Sun by the comprehensive program for ensuring peace on earth put forward by the Soviet Union 15 January. Addressing the mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized: "The Soviet program for building a world without nuclear and other types of weapons by the end of this century is addressed to everyone, because no one can remain indifferent in the face of the universal threat. We also address our call to Japan."

The publication of the Soviet program for saving mankind from the threat of universal annihilation coincided with the mid-January visit to Japan by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. Moscow's proposals generated the broadest response in the Japanese Islands and were one of the key subjects at the Tokyo talks.

Japan's mass news media described the visit as a "turning point." Indeed, following a break of 8 years, regular consultations at the level of leaders of the two countries' foreign policy departments were resumed, and talks were held that displayed a mutal interest and desire to develop dialogue at various levels and that yielded some specific results. The visit will definitely be of positive significance for Soviet-Japanese relations.

JAPANESE UNCERTAINTY OVER SDI DISCUSSED

LD181623 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1225 GMT 18 Feb 86

["What Does Tokyo Want Then" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Feb (TASS) -- TASS political observer Askold Biryukov writes:

According to reports from Tokyo, Japan's ruling Liberal-Democratic Party has expressed itself in favor of Japanese companies participating in "research work" within the framework of Washington's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." (Fudzio), one of the leaders of this party stated at a meeting with leaders of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs that private Japanese companies could be joining in this work, "without waiting for government will to be finally defined." Moreover, as the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI notes, Tokyo is proceeding from "concern over relations with the United States" in the run-up to the trip to Washington by Prime Minister Nakasone, the trip to Japan by Pentagon chief Weinberger and the forthcoming meeting in May of the "seven" in Tokyo. Let us note that this is not from the interests of preserving and strengthening peace, but from a "concern over relations" with Washington, which has adopted a policy of implementing the "star wars" program, at whatever cost.

In essence the decision of the ruling party predetermines the government's decision as well. Hitherto the latter has been occupying a cautious position on taking part in SDI. While in principle expressing "understanding" as regards this program of Washington's, official Tokyo has been dragging its feet on making a decision as to whether to take part in it and if it should decide to do so then in what way. As is evident, a decision was reached after the return from a trip to the United States by a second group of Japanese government experts which studied specific areas of technology in which Japan might cooperate with the United States on the SDI program. According to (Riodzi Onodera), a Foreign Ministry adviser and the leader of this group, the group "understood where the emphasis was to lie." The decision by the Japanese ruling party on taking part in SDI at a private level gave grounds for Schneider, the U.S. deputy secretary of state to say in London that having done so with the FRG the United States hopes to sign the relevant agreements with other potential SDI participants, including Japan, probably this summer.

Now Tokyo is searching for a pretext for doing this. The most "irresistable' one is not missing the boat. The same Liberal-Democratic Party has stated that it "considers it necessary to speed up scientific and technical progress by taking part in SDI." Experts in various fields assert that SDI 'research' will lead to major technological breakthroughs and Japan desperately needs to be involved in them in order not to fall behind technological progress.

But indeed, what is at stake is not only technical progress. Technological breakthroughs al come about in the course of research connected with peaceful mastering of space. SDI is a purely military venture and one which is capable of setting mankind right back, if it doesn't actually put a question mark over man's very existence.

In agreeing to take part in work on SDI, work moreover with a view to developing and testing new types of nuclear weapons, Japan is not only taking upon itself responsibility for destroying one of the conditions for strategic stability in the world. It is underminig to the very roots its own efforts, efforts being made by its representatives at the Geneva disarmament conference and in particular proposals on gradully putting an end to underground nuclear tests. We are not saying that work on SDI renders pointless the idea of concluding a treaty on complete and universal banning of nuclear tests, a ban which is favored by practically the entire international community. Japan has its chance to say its piece on the matter upon which depends the fate of this community. Is it going to make use of the chance or will it be lost once and for all?

U.S. SR-71 INTRUDES INTO DPRK AIRSPACE

LD122218 Moscow TASS in English 1954 GMT 12 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, February 12 TASS -- A U.S. reconnaissance plane "SR-71" intruded into the air space of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) over the country's territorial waters in the Sea of Japan to the east of the city of Kosong today, the Korean Central News Agency (KCNA) has reported. On the same day a similar spy plane made a flight over coastal waters off the western coast of the DPRK.

The intensification of reconnaissance flights over the DPRK's territory, KCNA points out, coincides with the start of large-scale U.S.-South Korean joint exercises "Team Spirit-86."

DRA FOREIGN MINISTER ANALYZES AFGHAN SITUATION

PM191023 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by DRA Foreign Minister Shah Mohammed Dost: "Tread of the Revolution"]

[Text] Kabul -- The victory of the national-democratic revolution in our land has led to the creation of a state of a new type -- the DRA. From the first days of the DRA's existence its foreign policy course elaborated by the PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan] has been aimed at creating the most favorable conditions for implementing the main goals of the April Revolution.

As defined in the PDPA program of action and the basic principles of the DRA, the republic's foreign policy sets as its main tasks the defense of the state's independence, national sovereignty, and territorial integrity. We invariably advocate halting imperialism's undeclared war. We are with those forces of the planet which are struggling for peace throughout the world, the curbing of the arms race, the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, and the attainment of universal and total disarmament.

In our foreign policy the friendly relations and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union, the Afghan people's tested and reliable friend, and the other fraternal socialist countries occupy a special place. We view these relations as the main guarantee of the conservation of our young republic's independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and its economic and social progress. The Afghan people are particularly grateful to their great northern neighbor for the timely international aid rendered to the DRA in the difficult period of our recent history when Afghanistan's very existence as a free, independent, nonaligned country was menaced.

The conservation of international peace is the most important task facing mankind. That is why we state again and again our resolute support for the Soviet Union's peace-loving policy and constructive initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race, preventing its spreading into outer space, and eliminating seats of tension in various parts of the world.

The 15 January statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is of particular importance. We are firmly convinced that the consistent implementation of its proposals will not only spare our planet from the threat of nuclear war, but will also prepare the ground for implementing man's long-standing dream of a world without wars and weapons. The statement opens up before all peoples a clear and explicit path for entering the third millennium without the threat of nuclear self-destruction. We also attach tremendous importance to the proposals contained in this historic document aimed at consolidating security on our continent, Asia.

The forces of imperialism, hegemony, and reaction have unleashed an evil undeclared war against us. The United States is primarily organizing, inspiring, and financing the criminal activity of the counterrevolutionary mercenaries who are sowing grief and death on Afghan soil. We should also cite China, which is supplying the bandits with modern, lethal weapons.

Pakistan has assumed the role of the main bridgehead of the undeclared war against the DRA. Over 100 military camps have been created here for training professional thugs, terrorists, and saboteurs who are then dispatched to Afghanistan. There are 18 camps in Iran and 8 in China. The reactionary regimes of some countries in the Persian Gulf zone are generously supplying the counterrevolution with the means for waging the criminal war.

The frenzied propaganda campaign of lies and slander which is being mounted against us by these same countries has become another aspect of the undeclared war. Suffice it to say that our foes have on five occasions increased their radio broadcasting to Afghanistan in Pushtu and Dari. The organization of anti-Afghan campaigns in the United Nations and other international organizations is one more important component of the subversive activity against the DRA. The illegal discussion of the so-called Afghan question foisted onto the UN General Assembly year after year is a characteristic example of such actions.

The DRA Government is doing everything possible for a political settlement of the situation around our country, which would be the key to peace in this region. Its 14 May 1980 and 24 August 1981 statements are known to everyone. They are supported by all progressive countries and forces of the world.

As a result of our efforts and initiatives and the support from the UN secretary general, there have been six rounds of talks with Pakistan through a personal representative of the UN secretary general. The DRA Government adheres to the view that an all-embracing settlement must provide for the complete cessation of armed aggression and other forms of outside interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. Impressive international guarantees should ensure that this interference is resumed in the future.

The progress which has been achieved at these talks was the result of the constructive and flexible position taken by the DRA. But under pressure from Washington, the other side is so far failing to display good will. For instance, despite the fact that the mandate of the UN secretary general and his representative presupposes the presence of both sides at the conference table, Pakistan is refusing to conduct direct talks.

Despite the intrigues of its enemeies, the April Revolution has proved its irreversibility. With the aid of our loyal friends, above all the Soviet Union, we have firmly marched forward along the path of building a new life. The Soviet Communists and fraternal Soviet people are now preparing for the 27th CPSU Congress. We are sure the congress will adopt important decisions in the interests of Soviet people's further progress and prosperity in the interests of peace and security on earth.

We wish our Soviet friends every success in their noble aspirations.

HUNGER STRIKE BY AFGHANS IN IRAN REPORTED

PM140951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Hunger Strike Declared"]

[Text] Kabul, 12 Feb -- BAKHTAR agency has reported that the inmates of the Afghan refugee camp in Mashhad (Iran) have declared a hunger strike. The 800 refugees taking part in it, who were lured into Iran by deception, have stated they will not cease their struggle until they receive permission to leave for home.

The Iranian authorities are trying to suppress the Afghans' demonstration by force. Clashes have taken place between the "guards of the Islamic revolution" and the refugees, the agency notes. As a result three camp inmates have been killed and eight wounded. Several dozen people have been arrested and imprisoned.

MANILA DEMONSTRATION PROTESTS U.S. 'INTERFERENCE'

LD181332 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] A demonstration of protest against U.S. interference in the internal affairs of the Philippines has been held in Manila in front of the U.S. Embassy. Thousands of demonstrators, whose progress was blocked by reinforced police units, chanted: Yankees go home. Observers link the action with the presence of Philip Habib, a special envoy of the U.S. President. Formally he arrived in Manila allegedly to seek reconciliation between the two antagonistic groupings. However, according to the press, in fact Washington's emissary intends to gain guarantees that American military and strategic interests in that country are secure.

SOVIET LINER SINKS OFF NEW ZEALAND; SAILOR MISSING

PM171803 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 6

[V. Shmyganovskiy article: "Emergency in the Cook Strait"]

[Text] A report has arrived from New Zealand: The Soviet liner Mikhail Lermontov has foundered and sunk off that country's coast. This happened at 1240 hours Moscow time on 16 February. All 408 passengers on board the ship were rescued.

V.S. Petukhov, chairman of the "Morpasflot" All-Union Association, said the following:

"Our ship was on a cruise off the New Zealand coast, carrying foreign passengers under contract with the British company [STS]. It suddenly ran aground at 0750 hours, while Captain V. Vorobyev and the pilot were steering it along the Cook Strait. The speed was 15 knots. The liner was holed in its bow. The captain steered for the shore. The bow trim increased and he ordered those on board to begin abandoning ship (in addition to the passengers, the ship was carrying a crew of 330. One of the Soviet seamen is still missing). All this happened during a sudden squall accompanied by rain. [punctuation as published]

The Vladivostok radio station was the first to receive the accident message: "We are abandoning ship, we are abandoning ship!"

The Soviet seamen acted with precision under the prevailing circumstances. Elderly women were evacuated first, followed by old men and all the other passengers. The captain was the last to abandon ship. We received a radiogram from Joe Collier, director of [STS] in Australia. He remarked on the crew's courage and presence of mind when rescuing the clients of this tourism firm.

"The cause of the accident and the ship's loss will be determined by a specially appointed commission," T.B. Guzhenko, USSR minister of the maritime fleet, commented. "The incident confirms again that even with all the modern equipment it is still impossible to rule out the chance of an accident situation developing at sea. [no end quotes printed]

This is the first such accident in many decades involving the Soviet cruise fleet, which enjoys an excellent reputation.

EASTERN EUROPE

POLAND'S MESSNER AKRIVES FOR OFFICIAL VISIT

Met by Ryzhkov, Aliyev

LD181548 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 18 TASS -- Zbigniew Messner, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, arrived here today on an official friendly visit at the Soviet Government's invitation.

At the airport he was welcomed by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Geydar Aliyev and other officials.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1630 GMT on 18 February, in a similar report, adds the following:

Representatives of Moscow's working people were among the welcoming party. The state flags of the PPR and the Soviet Union were raised at the airport, and an honor guard of forces from the Moscow garrison was formed. An orchestra played the state anthems of the two countries. Comrades Ryzhkov and Messner inspected the formation of Soviet servicemen. The festive reception ceremony ended with a march-past by the honor guard.

The state flags of the two countries and banners of welcome were displayed in Moscow's streets and squares, along which the motorcade proceeded accompanied by an honorary escort of motorcyclists.]

Talks Begin

LD190743 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0723 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 19 Feb (TASS) -- Soviet-Polish talks began in the Great Kremlin Palace this morning. The talks are being conducted by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and by Zbigniew Messner, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee, chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers.

The head of the Polish Government arrived in Moscow yesterday at the invitation of the Soviet Government on an official visit of friendship.

POLISH FOREIGN MINISTER BACKS GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

PM181001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by M. Orzechowski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and Polish minister of foreign affairs: "The Command of the Times"]

[Text] Warsaw, Feb -- The 15 January 1986 statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which contains new Soviet disarmament proposals was a political event of the highest order.

The statement was issued at an exceptionally difficult and dangerous moment in the international situation. The negative phenomena and trends which became particularly clearly visible at the beginning of the current decade have still not been overcome. People who favor an intensification of political tension and fueling of conflicts in various parts of the world, who oppose the territorial-political order which took shape in Europe after World War II, and advocate that all kinds of "embargoes" and "sanctions" be imposed in relations between states are still active in the West.

The U.S. military-industrial complex plays a sinister role in the definition of the aims and the choice of the instruments of the capitalist states' foreign policy and in promoting the growth of the international "infrastructure of tension." It seeks to induce other NATO states -- and unfortunately frequently not without success -- to increase their military budgets and to create [sozdaniye] ever news types of weapons and weapons systems, including nuclear ones.

The plans for the militarization of space envisaged in the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" advocated by President R. Reagan seem particularly criminal. They represent an aggressive concept. Their implementation would ultimately result in a qualitatively new stage of the arms race.

The full extent of their consequences and their cost, which would go beyond purely economic considerations, are difficult even to visualize. However, it is obvious that all previous accords on arms limitation would be violated. The opportunities for concluding new agreements would lose all real basis and the crisis of confidence would deepen. This would virtually nullify all chances of improving the international situation. Thus, hopes for an arms freeze and reduction, relaxation of tension, and elimination of the threat of a universal thermonulcear war would be thwarted, and mankind would find itself on a slippery path which would be difficult to leave.

However, the conviction that the world must not embark on the road is establishing itself increasingly firmly in the people's consciousness. Opportunities to curb the dangerous trends do exist. There are forces which are showing people a different direction of the development of civilization. They are connected with socialism. A historical merit of the Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policy is that at particularly critical moments it indicates real opportunities for changing the situation. This testifies to the profoundly humane nature of the USSR's international policy. In relations between states it puts peace and the preservation of life on the planet first and foremost.

The important initiative which the Soviet leader has submitted to the international community and which aims at the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, has sprung up on precisely this fertile ground. It is the latest manifestation of the sense of tremendous responsibility for the fate of the world which is so essential today. It is an expression of the optimism which has always characterized Soviet foreign policy.

In his statement, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee rightly emphasized: "Finding effective ways of eliminating nuclear weapons is a feasible task if we tackle it without delay!"

The Soviet proposals are at the same time comprehensive and specific. They touch on all the fundamental problems of disarmament talks currently under way, bearing in mind their achievements and trends, and include key questions of space and strategic weapons, questions pertaining to medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, as well as conventional weapons, and the creation of an atmosphere of confidence.

They offer a way out of the situation on issues where progress was blocked for a long time because of the unconstructive position of the West. The Soviet Union's determination to continue the quest for ways to improve the situation is also indicated by the fact that it has decided to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosion for another 3 months.

The USSR's proposals are a program on a historic scale, a program which offers realistic prospects and proposes specific ways of ridding mankind of the nuclear threat which hangs over it.

A 21st century without nuclear weapons is a bold aim, but given the good will of all interested states it is quite feasible. The program appeals not just to people's emotions but above all to their reason. It provides a clear alternative to the dubious "concepts" on which the bellicose U.S. plans on earth and in space are based.

On the one hand, there are the Soviet proposals to completely eliminate nuclear weapons, and on the other hand there is the U.S. obsession to replace them with an even more sophisticated system of space weapons. These are expressions of the diametrically different approaches to the fundamental issue of our time, the choice between war and peace. The Soviet approach provides for a real increase in international security, while the U.S. approach is based on the desire to achieve military and political superiority on the planet....

The point from which the Soviet peace initiative proceeds is the special responsibility borne by the USSR and the United States for the preservation of peace and international security. The statement also refers to, and defines, the role of other nuclear powers. The program submitted by the Soviet Union provides scope for all other states' and peoples' activity. After all, in the current complex and dangerous international situation peace and security are universal, indivisible assets to which no one can remain indifferent.

This applies particularly to Europe. This is where the watershed between the two major military and political groupings lies. Europe has been the seat of conflict more than once, but it has also acquired positive experience. And the Soviet leader bases his proposals on this experience. As the statement notes, this experience creates the preconditions for a special mission to be discharged by Europe: "This mission is the construction of a new edifice of detente."

The USSR's new proposals are firmly supported by the Warsaw Pact countries' joint peace platform. They are in keeping with the decisions adopted by the fraternal countries' top leaders and the achievements of their coordinated foreign policy as expressed in the documents of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting in Sofia, and the Prague summit. Thus the Soviet program is not just a document which provides inspiration for the foreign policy activity of the fraternal states. It is, essentially, their joint program; as W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, has noted, "a suitable platform for laying the foundations for a better, secure future of the world."

We note with satisfaction that the conditions for solving many of the current problems, and in particular overcoming the impasse in the question of arms limitation and reduction, have improved lately. The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva created opportunities for deepening the dialogue between the two powers. We expect the United States to also avail itself of these opportunities. The Soviet peace program represents a substantial contribution in this respect.

Discussing the prospects for the development of the international situation and defining the main tasks of Polish foreign policy in 1986, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo welcomed and expressed appreciation for the important Soviet initiatives and expressed its full support for them. The Council of Ministers, and subsequently also the Polish Sejm, adopted a similar stance. This is a natural consequence of the fact that questions pertaining to peace, disarmament, and international security occupy a special place among the factors which determine Polish foreign policy, are deeply rooted in public consciousness, and enjoy the support of broad strata of the people. This approach is based, on the one hand, on the ideological foundations of our socialist system, and on the other hand on the dramatic history of our country whose experience was threatened by wars more than once. The fraternal friendship, alliance, and cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist community states guarantee Poland's sovereign and independent existence within secure borders.

Our support for the Soviet peace program is based on the conviction that its implementation would further strengthen all these values. The ideas expressed in the statement fully coincide with Poland's state interests.

The 27th CPSU Congress is due to open in a few days. It will be an event of historic importance for Soviet Communists and for the entire communist and workers movement. We are convinced that the 27th Congress will add a new vivid page to the theory and practice of socialist building. Our party will carefully study the decisions of the Soviet Communists' forum and apply them creatively in its own activity.

CLOSER SOVIET-POLISH SCIENTIFIC TIES URGED

PM180930 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "To Deepen Integration"]

[Text] Warsaw, 15 Feb -- Addressing a meeting in Krakow devoted to the contribution of Polish science and technology to the development of the national economy, Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, declared that the establishment of closer ties with scientists from CEMA countries is highly important for the development of Polish science and the enhancement of its efficiency. It is necessary, he emphasized, to deepen and expand integration with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in various spheres. Under the conditions of the present economic situation in the country, he went on, we are bound to make fuller use of the achievements of science and find practical applications for every fruitful scientific idea and every design. Even though science is making a highly significant contribution to the republic's transformation, by no means everything in this sphere has been properly developed. This applies primarily to the entire planning of scientific research, the chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers stressed.

CAR BOMB EXPLODES NEAR U.S. EMBASSY IN LISBON

LD182314 Moscow TASS in English 2309 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Lisbon, February 19 TASS -- A powerful blast rocked the site of the U.S. Embassy in Lisbon. The blast was caused by the explosive device planted by unidentified persons in the boot of a car belonging to a U.S. embassy staff member, ANGOP news agency has reported. The blast caused no casualties. The Portuguese police opened an investigation into the incident.

FRENCH COMMUNISTS SEEK ASSEMBLY SESSION ON CHAD

LD180950 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 18 TASS -- A group of Communist deputies of the National Assembly of France have demanded the convocation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the chamber of the French parliament. The Communist deputies are going to include in the agenda of the session of the commission the questions dealing with the armed interference of France in the internal affairs of Chad and the stay in France of Duvalier, former head of the dictatorial regime in Haiti. The document prepared by the Communist deputy Robert Montdargent which has been published in Paris points out that the parliamentarians representing the French Communist Party also find it necessary to discuss measures that France could take with a view to promoting the solution of the disarmament problem.

'EURO-SDI' POSSIBLE NOW, CLAIMS FRG'S WOERNER

LD171133 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Announcer-read report from the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] It is to a certain degree easier for the Americans to maneuver in Europe because they have their allies here, the North Atlantic Treaty members, and the Atlantic discipline. The Americans broke Britain first, as you know; now it is the turn of the FRG. Pressure is being exerted against that country now in terms of the SDI. And at the same time, negotiations on a sort of Euro-SDI are now being increasingly actively conducted. For instance, Manfred Woerner, FRG minister of defense, writes the following opinion: There is no need to wait for all sorts of laser miracles. An antimissile defense system could be created [sozdat], the minister considers, using the equipment and technology which is already in existence or will very soon be created. This system, Woerner writes, could be deployed regardless of the hopes that the research currently being carried out by the United States on the SDI program will yield anything new. In other words, what is being offered is a wholly American sort of logic: Instead of reducing the existing weapons, it is recommended that new weapons should be added, describing them, that is, as defensive.

Well, in the final analysis, where Europe is concerned, the Americans will apparently say this: In general, we are ready to take away our missiles, if you take away yours, but France and Britain object. They do not want to freeze their nuclear forces at the current level. Well, if one is speaking and thinking about the Americans' reply, then on the whole, they will evidently agree with us in principle at the level, so to speak, of general phrases; but on all specific points I think that they will avoid positive decisions and seek some sort of way round them. (?The motivation for such a refusal is more or less respectable), but it is unlikely that they will agree with us.

GORBACHEV INTRODUCTION TO GREEK EDITION OF WORKS

NC161710 Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek 16 Feb 86 p 5

["Text" of introduction by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the Greek edition of his speeches and articles; "carried in advance" by RIZOSPASTIS]

[Text] In acceding to a request by the "Contemporary Era" publishing house to prepare a brief introduction to this selection, I was first of all guided by the fact that Soviet citizens have deep and strong feelings for Greece and its people. Thus, by addressing myself to the Greek reader, I have a chance to express these feelings to some degree.

I also hope this book will give you an opportunity to get a feel for life today in Soviet society, to make your own assessment of our way of life, our goals, our understanding of mankind's present and future, and our ideas on the key problem of our times. How to safeguard peace and avert the danger of a new war.

We are sincere toward the world and we speak frankly about our affairs. Our primary concern is a long-term one: to significantly accelerate our country's social and economic development, and to double our productive capacity by the year 2000. We have all the necessary means to achieve this: natural wealth, a strong economic base, and rich experience from our 70 years of socialist construction. We have a clear idea of the ground we will have to cover, including all the problems, difficulties, and obstacles we will have to overcome.

The totally peaceful and creative nature of our domestic duties and plans rules out any pursuit of military supremacy and expansion, which those who are seeking exactly this have been eager to accuse us of. For us, peace is peace for all -- this, in a few words, is our creed, which Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, bequeathed to us.

During the nuclear-space age, we should all be aware of the fact that it is impossible for anyone to achieve peace and security solely for himself, solely through his own efforts, without others -- and, what is more -- at the expense of others. There must be coordination between national interests and the interests of the entire world community. It is of exceptional significance to have every rational man be fully conscious of this, and to become aware of his own personal responsibility to avert the danger of war by decisively siding against war on earth or in space. The unbridled arms race, primarily the one involving nuclear arms, which militaristic circles in the West have imposed and which they are now trying to spread to space, has brought mankind to a dangerous point.

In an attemtpt to avoid a catastrophe, the Soviet Union has launched a series of coordinated and practical initiatives on all issues concerning a halt to the arms race and the achievement of diarmament. With the strength of a healthy idea, and by setting an example of self-restraint and self-restriction, we have been trying to stop the dangerous course of international developments and to create a safer course of events. Unfortunately, no agreement has been reached on the basic and vital problem of halting the arms race and preventing its expansion into space. Thus, it is of particular importance to have reason prevail so that people may learn the art of coexistence on our planet, which is so imperative.

The Soviet Union, which devotes all its strength to the defense of world peace, acknowledges the contributions of all who are guided by similar ideals.

In addition, the Soviet Union greatly appreciates Greece's peace-loving actions in the field of foreign policy and views them as a significant factor for the consolidation of peace in the Balkans, the Middle East, Europe, and the world at large. The cause of world peace would benefit from the conversion of the Balkans into a missile-free zone.

The Soviet Union wholeheartedly supports the demand of the people of the Mediterranean basin, who ask that it be transformed into a sea of peace and cooperation.

The peace-loving and constructive proposals made by Greece, Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, India, and Tanzania have struck a positive chord in the world, for they respond to the interests of safeguarding international security.

The peoples of our two countries are linked by a long friendship, the roots of which are centuries old. Our two peoples have been together in many struggles for freedom, and today -- despite our different social systems -- there are many things that bring us close to one another. The Soviet people's antiwar aims are in accord with the activities of the Greek antiwar movement and with the European public's increasing protests against the arms race, the stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Europe, and the militarization of space.

The experience gained from the development of Soviet-Greek relations proves that the framework of our cooperation in the political, economic, cultural, scientific, and other fields is increasing and becoming wider. We would like to see the unimpeded development of this process, which is very good, and the strengthening of understanding and cooperation between our two peoples.

I wish the readers of this book and the entire Greek people peace and prosperity.

Moscow, January 1986

Mikhail Gorbachev.

BELGIAN SOCIALISTS SUPPORT USSR ARMS PROPOSALS

LD172017 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Brussels February 17 TASS -- A session of the Bureau of the Belgian Socialist Party (French-speaking wing) here has highly evaluated the Soviet peace initiatives. The party's executive body issued a statement which says that the plan of eliminating nuclear weapons, proposed by the Soviet Union, is of great interest and opens up real opportunities for opening a dialogue. Walloon socialists received with great satisfaction the USSR's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear tests, the document emphasizes. Moscow's recent proposals are the evidence of the Soviet side's readiness for negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons, the statement says. The Bureau expressed the hope that the United States and its allies in NATO would give a constructive response to the Soviet initiative.

COMMENTATORS EXAMINE RECENT IRAQ-IRAN FIGHTING

Bovin Views Developments

PM151845 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "A Senseless War"]

[Text] Late in the evening of 10 February Iranian troops launched an offensive on the southern sector of the front. Reports from the region of hostilities are highly contradictory. By all appearances, the Iranians managed to force the Shatt al 'Arab waterway and penetrate deep into Iraqi territory. Tehran has announced that Iranian troops have seized the ports of Al-Faw and Umm Qasr, consolidated their position on Umm al Rasas island, and approached the Kuwaiti border. Baghdad decisively rejects these reports and announces that the Iranian offensive became bogged down.

In a letter to the chairman of the UN Security Council, T. 'Aziz, Iraqi deputy prime minister and foreign minister, stated: "In committing this act of aggression the Iranian regime is pursuing two strategic goals: It seeks to occupy, first, the region around the city of Basra and, second, the southern regions of Iraq located along the Iraq-Kuwait border." This act of aggression is "part of military preparations for the future, in order, if the set goals are achieved, to put the territorial integrity of the Persian Gulf countries in jeopardy and expand their own territory at their expense." Tehran, in its turn, stresses that its actions do not threaten other Arab states and that Iran's only aim is "to punish the Ba'thist Baghdad regime."

On Wednesday 12 February, a session of the "committee of seven" of the Arab League (Jordan, Iraq, the Yemen Arab Republic, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Morocco) was held in Baghdad. The committee approved a program of emergency measures to oppose the "new offensive." Arab League General Secretary Ch. Klibi called for the adoption of political and diplomatic measures with a view to "pooling the efforts of Arab and friendly countries for the sake of establishing peace, ending the war, and settling a conflict which creates a threat to the Arab nation and to international peace and security."

Meanwhile, the senseless, cruel, endless war goes on. Iraq calculates that it started on 4 September 1980, when Iranian artillery shelled Iraqi territory. Iran reckons hostilities from 22 September, when Iraqi troops crossed the border. However you calculate it, they have been fighting for nearly 5 and 1/2 years...

Why? What for? Evidently some role was played by territorial disputes, which have caused conflicts between Arabs and Persians for centuries. The latest treaty governing the line of the border between Iran and Iraq was concluded in June 1975. By all appearances the compromise achieved under pressure from the shah did not suit Iraq and on 17 September 1980 Baghdad denounced the treaty. The deterioration in relations between the two neighboring countries was influenced by Tehran's repeated, urgent calls for Iraqi's Shi'ites to rise up and overthrow the "Ba'thist regime." In any case, a million human lives -- and that is the estimate of the two sides' losses -- is too high a price, an incredibly high price, to pay for the "clarification of relations" between Baghdad and Tehran.

And every day that the new flareup of military acitivity lasts will cost thousands more lives. It was reported that Tehran radio interrupted its usual programs to call on the Iranians to give blood to "save the lives of the wounded and sick." Commenting on this appeal, Baghdad radio stated: "There is no sense in appealing for donors, since there will be no wounded. You should ask for coffins and shrouds. This time we will spare nobody."

I quote this detail so that readers can understand and sense the fever of passions, the atmosphere of cruelty which prevail on the banks of Shatt al 'Arab.

The war is not in Iran's interests or Iraq's interests. It undermines the unity of anti-imperialist forces. It has a pernicious effect on both countries' economies. Many times it has been proposed that hostilities cease on the terms of return to a status quo. Baghdad is willing. Tehran is resolutely against it.

Demchenko Comments

PM181031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Pavel Demchenko's "Observer's Opinion" under the general heading "Iran-Iraq: The Conflict Worsens"]

[Text] This war, which is now in its 6th year, is described as senseless, fratricidal, and endless. Indeed, what we have are two neighboring states, which adopt similar stances on many foreign policy questions and which are required to carry out essentially the same tasks of national development, locked in mortal combat. Its scale can be judged from the number of casualties which, according to foreign press figures, are already close to 1 million dead and wounded. The figures are perhaps on the high side, but not, judging by all accounts, by much. At the end of last year, for example, Iranian parliamentary deputy Hoseini stated that 300,000 Iranians had been killed, maimed, or reported missing in action.

And yet, despite the enormous casualties draining both peoples dry and the very large material damage caused, all efforts at mediation by international organizations and individual countries to bring Iran and Iraq to the negotiating table have failed. The sides' stances have remained uncompromising. Moreover, a new outbreak of hostilities occurred a few days ago, when the Iranian Army launched its latest offensive The aim of this offensive, foreign observers think, is to cut Iraq off from the Persian Gulf and reach the Kuwaiti border.

Thus, there arises the threat of the conflict spreading still farther. It is clear that this dangerous escalation of events is not only increasing the toll of senseless deaths, but is also heating up the situation in the region and providing the Pentagon with a new argument for maintaining major naval and air forces close to the Persian Gulf.

Assessing the prevailing situation, a representative of the UN secretary general said that historical experience demonstrates the impossibility of solving by force the problems that underlie the conflict. Political means must be used. As is well known, the Soviet Union, which advocates the earliest possible end to the war, has repeatedly called for just that.

'Unprecedented Intensity'

LD181940 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 18 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Ancient civilizations have risen and been quickly destroyed in the valley between the Tigris and the Euphrates; bloody wars have flared up. Future historians will undoubtedly register the present armed conflict between Iran and Iraq as the most destructive and pointless of all of them. Battles of unprecedented intensity have now been in progress for a week between the armies of the two countries.

Both those who desire an end to the loss of life and suffering of the Iraqi and Iranian peoples and those who, pouring oil on the flames, are interested in further stepping up tension in the Persian Gulf, are following these lamentable events closely. A precise picture of the situation at the front cannot be established; conflicting reports are coming in from Baghdad and Tehran.

A communique of the Iraqi military command today reports that a considerable proportion of the Iranian troops who crossed the Shatt al 'Arab, where the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates come together, has been destroyed, that the enemy has lost the initiative and is fighting defensive battles. Iraqi troops are attacking in the direction of Al-Faw port, on the shore of the Persian Gulf and just a few kilometers from the border with Kuwait, this report says.

But then the dispatches from Tehran present diametrically opposed information. According to IRNA, the Iranian troops who have seized an operational bridgehead in the south of Iraq are continuing their offensive in the direction of that country's naval base on the Persian Gulf, Um Qasr.

One thing is clear: Fierce fighting is going on, using aviation, artillery, armored tank, and land forces. Iraqi aircraft alone have in the last 24 hours made more than 600 combat sorties on the southern part of the front. By all accounts, the Iranian command is trying to throw fresh reinforcements in to the Al-Law region, but it is stated in Baghdad, and I quote, that the noose around the enemy forces is being drawn tighter and tighter with every passing hour. Iraqi aviation is bombing river and sea crossings in order to stop the enemy from consolidating on the occupied bridgehead. Military operations have also been stepped up on other sectors of the front.

The war has flared up on the doorstep of the neighboring Arab countries of the Persian Gulf. There is increasing concern in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and other countries of the region. A few days ago Shaykh Jabir al-Sabah, Amir of Kuwait made a trip to Bubyan island, which is in the immediate vicinity of the zone of combat action of Iranian and Iraqi troops. Kuwait and other Persian Gulf countries have been forced to adopt emergency measures in case the theater of military operations expands.

IRAQI FOREIGN MINISTER TRAVELS TO MOSCOW

JN162001 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1945 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 16 Feb (INA) -- Tariq 'Aziz, Iraqi deputy prime minister and foreign minister, arrived here tonight on a short working visit to the Soviet Union. He will hold talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze tomorrow.

Tariq 'Aziz was received by Georgiy Korniyenko, Soviet first deputy minister of foreign affairs, Vladimir Polyakov, chief of the Near Eastern Countries Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, and several other Foreign Ministry officials.

'Aziz' View on Talks

JN170930 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0904 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Feb (INA) -- Talks were held here today between Tariq 'Aziz, Iraqi deputy prime minister and foreign minister, and Eduard Shevardnadze, the USSR foreign minister.

'Aziz told INA that he briefed Shevardnadze on the Arab 8-member followup committee's decisions and plan of action aimed at prompting the UN Secretary Council and the international community to exert effective and decisive efforts to establish peace and a just settlement for the Iraq-Iran war. He also said that he informed the Soviet foreign minister of Iraq's firm readiness to defeat the unjust Iranian aggression against Iraqi territory. The talks were successful, he added. Attending the talks on the Iraqi side were Sa'd 'Abd al-Majid, the Iraqi ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Dr Riyadh al-Qaysi, ambassador at the Iraqi Foreign Ministry. It was attended on the Soviet side by Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Vladimir Polyakov, chief of the Near Eastern Countries Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

YSP SECRETARY GENERAL ARRIVES IN MOSCOW

GF151939 Aden Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Brother 'Ali Salim al-Bayd, secretary general of the YSP [Yemen Socialist Party] Central Committee, arrived in Moscow today. He was received at the airport by Comrade Boris Nikolayevich Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and a number of Soviet officials.

IZVESTIYA COMMENTATOR DISCUSSES MIDEAST ISSUES

GF171730 Kuwait AL-ANBA' in Arabic 16 Feb 86 p 20

[Interview with Konstantin Geyvandov, Izvestiya senior commentator, by AL-ANBA' correspondent in Amman Therese Haddad -- date not given]

[Text] [Haddad] How does Moscow view the Middle East issue and the Palestinian issue and the major principles which can ensure peace?

[Geyvandov] The Middle East problem is an important problem to which the Soviet Union devotes special attention. The Soviet view on this problem is similar to the Arab view. The most important principles which can ensure the achievement of just and lasting peace in the Middle East region are the complete Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination on their land and homeland. These two points can serve as a good basis for establishing a strong unified Arab front to settle the problem. We in the Soviet Union will play our role in supporting this just demand and in conveying it to the friends of the Soviet Union. I assure you that the Arab right will remain weak in the absence of Arab unity and unanimity. When the Arabs unite their views they will be an effective force of pressure to support their cause in the international community. I must point out that Arab-Soviet relations are not much affected by Arab-Arab differences. The Soviet Union is concerned about Arab solidarity and has exerted distinguished efforts to resolve disputes and differences in favor of the region's peoples.

[Haddad] What are the view and position of the Soviet Union on the Iraq-Iran war?

[Geyvandov] Since the beginning the Soviet Union has expressed its desire to see an end to this war by resorting to the negotiating table to resolve all disputes arising from the war. We have always affirmed that this war is in the interest of neither side. It will only lead to economic, material, and human losses and damage and will only divert the attention of Arabs from their basic issue -- the Palestine cause.

[Haddad] There are Israeli threats to Syria. What role will the Soviet Union play should a war erupt between the two sides?

[Geyvandov] The Soviet Union has offered a lot in supporting Syria, which has intimate relations with us. The Soviet Union will continue to offer its aid. However, it is not possible to guess what role the Soviet Union will play in case Syria is subjected to an Israeli attack. It is premature to talk about this.

[Haddad] Some Arabian Gulf countries have recently established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. There is information that some other Gulf countries will establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in the future. What is your comment?

[Geyvandov] It is quite normal that the Soviet Union and some Gulf countries establish relations. We are interested in having friendship relations with all Arab countries without exception. The Soviet Union has always backed the Arab issues on the basis of its belief that these are just issues. Moreover, the Soviet Union's relations with friendly countries are always governed by mutual respect, noninterference in the local affairs of other countries, and equality.

[Haddad] Recent incidents in Aden were a shock to the socialist bloc in general and to the Soviet Union in particular. The incidents took place among comrades in arms and among members of the party. How does Moscow view these incidents?

[Geyvandov] What happened in Aden was a shock to the Soviet Union and is a part of attempts to cause problems in the Arab arena by Israel. We know that the Arab-Israeli struggle which began 40 years ago is still governing many equations in the region. Israel and the United States are insisting on dragging the region into internal disputes to divert its attention from the basic and major role represented in the confrontation of the Israeli aggression. The Iraq-Iran war, the bloody incidents in Lebanon, and other regional battles which take place from time to time are merely conflicts designed to divert the attention of Arabs from their major issue. The Aden incidents are internal incidents and on this basis the Soviet Union warned against interfering in the local affairs of Aden. I think that the Arab differences and the incidents in the Middle East have great influence on what is going on in Aden.

[Haddad] There is tension in the Arab Maghreb between Libya and the United States. The situation may explode and military clashes may occur between the two sides at any time. What will your position be if this happens?

[Geyvandov] The Soviet Union has strongly denounced the media, political, and economic crusade launched by the U.S. Administration against Libya. It has also recently warned the United States against military interference in Libya and described the U.S. military demonstration opposite the Libyan coasts as organized terrorism and muscle flexing against an independent and sovereign state.

[Haddad] Some world news agencies have reported that Moscow is considering establishing diplomatic relations with the Zionist entity. Is this true?

[Geyvandov] The Soviet position has not changed and will not change so long as the Israelis are occupying Arab territories. This position is known to the Americans, the Israelis, and to the whole world. So long as things remain unchanged, the Soviet position will also remain unchanged.

HAITI BLOCKS RETURN, DEPORTS MOST EMIGRES

LD190946 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Havana, February 19 TASS -- The pro-Duvalier military-civilian council of Haiti is not going to give permission to a free return to the country of hundreds of thousands of emigres who fled Haiti during the dictatorial rule. The new minister of justice said in an interview with the newspaper LE MATIN published in Port-au-Prince that only those would be able to return to the country who were issued an entry visa. According to the local press, the police and immigration authorities continue to deport from Haiti the people who returned home without a special permission. Political observers point out that these practices are evidence of the intention of the authorities to block the return to Haiti of political opposition figures.

NICARAGUA PROTESTS U.S. TROOP MOVEMENTS

LD151026 Moscow TASS in English 1002 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Managua, February 15 TASS -- The decision by the Pentagon to move about 200 U.S. servicemen to the northern border zone of Costa Rica under the pretext of building civilian facilities is evidence of the United States' total disregard for the peace efforts by Latin American states, says a message by Nicaragua's Foreign Ministry. The document addressed to the foreign ministers of the Contadora Group countries says that in defiance of the calls by the Contadora Group for building mutual trust among Central American states and creating an auspicious climate for peaceful talks, the U.S. Administration tries to obstruct the normalization of relations between Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

The new militarist action by the United States constitutes a brazen challenge to the Contadora Group, Jose Leon Talavera, deputy foreign minister of Nicaragua, said in an interview with the newspaper BARRICADA. He said that the United States is eager to bring to naught the efforts by Nicaragua and Costa Rica to foster bilateral ties disrupted as a result of the provocative actions by CIA mercenaries in the area of the border shared by them. The latest measures taken by the governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica with a view to normalizing relations are a major step in the cause of settling the situation in Central America and exposing the policy of the Reagan Administration as the sole cause of the aggravation of the regional crisis, Talavera underlined. The deputy foreign minister confirmed full support by the republic's government for the idea of setting up a special commission of the Contadora Group to establish control over the Nicaraguan-Costa Rican border zone.

IZVESTIYA PROFILES NEW COSTA RICAN PRESIDENT

PM181512 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

["Who's Who: Oscar Arias Sanchez" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Excerpts] Oscar Arias Sanchez, presidential candidate of the ruling National Liberation Party, was victorious in the general elections held in the Republic of Costa Rica. O. Arias Sanchez advocates the continuation of the former government's economic and political line. The new president of the republic declared at a press conference for foreign journalists immediately after the elections that in the foreign policy sphere he would adhere to the principles of respect for the peoples' right to self-determination, noninterference in other countries' internal affairs, and the peaceful solution of the conflict in Central America. He also noted that he intends to hold talks on changing the repayment conditions for the external debt, which exceeds 4 billion dollars, and on establishing relations with the IMF which would not hinder the country's social development.